The Nation

Vol. CIV NEW YORK, THURSDAY, APRIL 12, 1917 No. 2702

The Week

WHEN Senator Williams invited Senator La Follette's attention to the difference between a prize court and a torpedo, he gave the human answer to all the labored arguments about British violation of international law counterbalancing German violation of international law. It is a reply which renders vain all the subtle discussions of priority of date as between British blockade and German blockade. We are now at war with Germany because the German leaders have been unable or unwilling to perceive that the American mind is not cast in the mould of the rigid German logic which holds that, once there is necessity, there is no difference between the necessity which ransacks American mails and the necessity which destroys innocent American lives. And the leaders of Germany, too, in their heart of hearts, are to-day wondering whether the distinction is not valid. They must be calculating the amount of damage the U-boats have done to England and the damage they have done to Germany. They must be wondering where America would be standing to-day if not for the long record from the Lusitania to the Aztec.

DEBATE on war resolutions is the American precedent. When Madison sent in his war message on June 1, 1812, the House took two days to report a declaration of war and one day more to pass it, whereupon the Senate spent no less than twelve days in discussing it. What the ultimate issue would be was fairly clear, and the country chafed under the suspense. In 1846 the war was well under way, having begun in April, before Congress got around to a declaration in early May; but Polk's war message of the 11th was not followed by Congressional action till the 13th. Even in 1898 McKinley sent his message demanding that "the war in Cuba must stop" on April 11, while the declaration did not come till the 19th. It will not be forgotten that Representative Boutelle argued at length against his party, in favor of a modification of the Cuban resolutions.

TAKING possession of the German ships in our ports does not necessarily involve the question whether our treaty with Prussia of 1828 is still in full force and effect. Even in that treaty there is a clause providing that, in case of war between the two countries, "if anything is necessary to be taken from them [*i. e.*, from alien citizens] for the use of such armed force, the same shall be paid for at a reasonable price." It might be held that the German ships came under this provision. The treaty aimed to prevent destruction or confiscation of enemy property. It could not supersede the right of the Government to requisition any property, alien or other, on payment of what it is worth. We make no doubt that it is the intention of the Administration to see to it that the owners of these ships are, at the end of the war, paid in full. There is the additional question whether enemy ships in our ports at the outbreak of the war should not have received the customary days of grace in which to put to sea. In the present instance this was rather academic. The ships are disabled and could not have sailed if they had been allowed to. Moreover, even if they had been in condition to proceed, they would not have ventured forth, since their capture by British or French cruisers would have been certain to follow.

THE indifference with which official and officially inspired Germany professes to view our entrance into the war is based on the commonplace that we cannot for a long time affect the military situation. But we have already begun to affect the military situation by affecting the temper of Germany as a whole. We have already begun to play a part in the war when the Berlin *Vorwärts* can cry out for an instant remedy against "the tempest of the world's public opinion based on the belief that Germany is a tyrant and despotic conqueror and its enemies are the harbingers of liberty." We have already begun to affect the world situation when the Liberal press in Germany, when the nation as a whole, with the exception of the Junkers and the Tirpitzites, hails the promise of "a people's kingdom of the Hohenzollerns." Let German editors who speak bitterly of our taking up arms for the undoing of Germany reflect whether, but for our coming in, they would now have occasion to congratulate themselves on the fact that, "clearly and unequivocally, the will of the Kaiser not only to maintain but to strengthen the bonds between ruler and people, comes to expression."

QUITE as a surprise came the message of President Menocal of Cuba recommending that the Congress of the island republic should join the United States in declaring war upon Germany. One cogent reason given was the immense difficulty in maintaining Cuban neutrality. Tied up as Cuba is in such close commercial bonds with this country, it would be almost impossible for her to stand with entire impartiality between the United States and Germany. But President Menocal went further. He wished to associate Cuba with the other democracies that were uniting against Prussian autocracy and Prussian disregard of law and of humanity in the conduct of war at sea. Moreover, the Cuban President argued that Cuban gratitude to the United States, first for freeing the island and then for helping it set up self-government, should be motive enough for joining fortunes in war. This is really the most significant aspect of the whole affair. Actual material aid that Cuba could give us may be negligible, but her attitude of cordial support is to be valued. It is a moral reward to the United States for the generous course we have followed in Cuba. In a small way, it is like the rallying of the Boers to the help of Great Britain—the fruit of a wise political policy. There are few weapons of war in Cuba's hand, but she holds it out to us in a beautiful gesture.

IF there is one American who should be in a position to understand the German Government and to do it justice, it surely is Herbert C. Hoover. He has not been subjected to the malicious English propaganda of which Germany so

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bitterly complains. He has not let himself be hoodwinked by Reuter's into exaggerating the facts of German conduct or misinterpreting the spirit of German policy. He has been on the spot and has seen for himself. And his conclusions are now expressed in his dispatch to President Wilson:

> We wish to tell you that there is no word in your historic statement that does not find a response in all our hearts. . . . Although we break with great regret our associations with many German individuals . . . there is no hope for democracy or liberalism unless the system which brought the world into this unfathomable misery can be stamped out once for all.

Is it English gold, so notoriously responsible for the false state of public opinion in America, that induced Mr. Hoover to speak out like this?

THE recommendation of the Committee on Labor, of which Mr. Gompers is chairman, to the Council of National Defence, is in effect that it should constitute itself into a final board of arbitration during the war. Strikes and lockouts should be prohibited, and necessary changes of standards made by the Council; State Legislatures are urged not to make any changes in safeguards, health, welfare, and hours of workers without the consent of the Council, and to grant power for the changing of such conditions as are recommended. This is a wise centralization of authority. The presence of representatives of capital will insure due protection of their interests; and the heads of labor organizations should be able to see to it that the improved conditions of labor are not needlessly sacrificed. Secretary Wilson's phrase of some days ago may well be the motto for the work of the Council:

> Ours is a democracy. It would not be worth our while going into the conflict if, when we come out of it, we do not still have a democracy.

DIFFERENCES of opinion among leaders of the Russian revolution concerning the settlement after the war are revealed in the statements of Minister of Justice Kerensky and Foreign Minister Milyukov. But there is no difference of opinion regarding the possibility of a separate peace for Russia. For Kerensky and Tchekheidze, as representatives of the extreme radical factions, peace will be in sight when the German people have rid themselves of the Hohenzollerns. For Milyukov the situation presents itself in terms of territorial rearrangements. But though Milyukov's demands for a reorganized Austria-Hungary and the Dardanelles for Russia are far reaching, his terms are really not more exigent than Kerensky's demand for overturning the monarchy in Germany. If either of these demands is to be realized before Petrograd consents to discuss peace, the Allies have no reason to worry over the possible defection of Russia. When the German people has settled its score with its own rulers, Russia will not be the only member of the Allies to regard the war as virtually at an end.

IN the meanwhile the revolutionary forces in Russia are making use of the respite granted them by the impossibility of extended military operations to come to an understanding on matters which might seriously compromise the success of the revolution. On the one hand the Constitutional Democrats, under the leadership of Milyukov and representing moderate opinion, have consented to the distribution of all the land among the peasants. This, with the liberties already decreed in the way of free speech and assembly and the enormous extension of the trade-union principle, should round out the radical programme. The radical leaders, on the other hand, seem to recognize that the time has come to restrict agitation among the soldiers at the front, with possibly serious consequences in the face of a German attack. It is not in mere excess of revolutionary fervor that the radicals have been so preoccupied with the army. The purpose obviously has been to lose no time in permeating the troops with the revolutionary gospel and so to establish safeguards against a counter-revolution. The difficult problem which the revolutionists have to face is to undermine the ancient discipline in such fashion as to make it difficult for a reactionary commander to lead his army against the Government in emergency, and yet to maintain discipline for holding the line against the Germans.

THE junction of British and Russian forces along the Diala River, on the Perso-Mesopotamian frontier northeast of Bagdad, signalizes what is perhaps the most successful coördinated military operation the Allies have shown since the beginning of the war. When the British delivered the final blow at Kut-el-Amara, the Russians were in the neighborhood of Hamadan and immediately took advantage of the Turkish defeat on the Tigris. The Russian advance from Hamadan to Khanikin covered nearly 250 miles in six weeks, a remarkable rate of progress considering the nature of the country through which the march lay. The territory won from the Turks by this advance and the parallel Russian movement further north in the mountains south of Lake Urumiah represents a gain of more than 25,000 square miles. The present Anglo-Russian alignment along the Diala River recalls something of the precision of the advance of Mackensen and Hindenburg into Russia two years ago. The next step is undoubtedly a move upon Mosul, some 200 miles north of Bagdad. With the Allies established at that point the whole Turkish campaign in Armenia will be affected, and an Allied line will have been established from the Black Sea to the Persian Gulf, cutting off a vast Turkish area which must count heavily if it should come to a matching of conquests at a peace conference.

WITH the retirement of Gen. Foch from active service goes the last of the outstanding figures to whom France and the world owe the victory of the Marne and the frustration of German hopes. It will long continue to be debated whether the principal credit for the Marne, after Joffre, should go to Foch, who broke the German centre in the marshes of St. Gond; to Manoury, who threw himself on the German right flank on the Ourcq and forced the dislocation in the enemy line which gave Foch his opportunity; or to Castelnau, who beat off the Kaiser's armies from Nancy and by holding the line of eastern fortifications gave Joffre the necessary breathing spell. The allocation of credit is difficult, because it involves a choice among three factors, each of which was essential to victory. Joffre, Manoury, and Foch are now in retirement, and Castelnau's activities seem to be restricted to military-diplomatic missions such as took him to Petrograd on the eve of the revolution.

IT is natural that the suggestion of a huge gift of money by our Government to France should have appealed to the warm-hearted impulses of the people. The high-minded-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ness, self-sacrifice, and lofty patriotism displayed by the France of this European war have rightly emphasized in the American mind remembrance of the loans and subsidies granted by France to our own struggling Government in the War of Independence. What course events may take, in regard to these and similar financial relations, if we are to participate in a long and exhaustive war, it would be premature to say. But generous proposals of this kind must be judged in the light of an actual situation, and that situation is to-day that France has asked no help from other nations, that she is financing her own war necessities uncomplainingly, and that we do not yet know what other and even more imperative financial requisitions may not presently be laid on our store of wealth and capital.

IT is to be regretted that the facts of this Revolutionary debt to France have been so wildly misstated by the proposers of the plan—the more so because, as stated, they have put a very unpleasant color on our own past history. We are told that if these Revolutionary loans of France were to be repaid, principal and interest, "the total amount would far exceed $1,000,000,000." Now, the truth is, first, that the loans by France from 1778 to 1783 were duly repaid when they matured, one or two decades later, and, secondly, that neither the original loans nor an imagined increment of unpaid interest up to 1917 would approach the figure named. Trevelyan's careful estimate of the total money obtained from France by Franklin for the colonies is 26,000,000 francs, or, roughly, $5,200,000. Professor Sumner points out that this debt fell due by fixed instalments only after 1787. In 1783, indeed, Hamilton's special report stated the whole foreign debt incurred in the Revolution to be $7,800,000. By 1795, only $2,024,000, not yet due, was outstanding for the account of France, and our Ambassador at Paris was actually discussing a loan by the United States to France. That our Government has not for a century and a quarter been repudiating its foreign debt of the Revolution, the authors of these recent assertions might have learned by re-reading the Constitution of the United States, whose Sixth Article provides that "all debts and engagements entered into, before the adoption of this Constitution, shall be as valid against the United States under this Constitution as under the Confederacy."

RICHARD OLNEY was a man who in private as well as public life impressed beholders with his strong qualities. He was always positive and hard-hitting. Both as Attorney-General and Secretary of State he displayed a kind of imperious vigor that made enemies while it compelled admiration. He was distinctly one of President Cleveland's "finds." Scarcely known outside Massachusetts when he entered the Cabinet, Mr. Olney became and remained a national figure. It was something more than an empty compliment when President Wilson urged him to go as Ambassador to England; it was recognition of an erect and dominating figure in the Democratic party. Political success for such a man is a good deal of a mystery to politicians. They see him wholly without the arts of the demagogue, with a touch of scorn about him and a certain asperity; yet they note with surprise how he gains public respect and even confidence. When he was at the head of the Department of State Mr. Olney had to his credit two achievements stamped with his personal characteristics. One was his firm handling of the Cuban difficulty, at the end of Cleveland's second term. His cool public statement that a joint resolution of Congress in favor of recognizing Cuban belligerency would be regarded by the President merely as an expression of opinion by estimable gentlemen, and not at all binding the Executive, was as audacious an act as Washington ever saw. In Secretary Olney's Venezuelan notes to Lord Salisbury that British diplomat found a pungent directness which visibly annoyed him. Luckily, the threatening controversy was ended without leaving bitterness on either side. It did, however, leave behind it Secretary Olney's famous phrase about the word of the United States being a "fiat" in all this hemisphere. In such affairs our diplomacy has since learned to employ a lighter tread.

A MEMBER of Congress is fined $800, with costs of $1,200, and resigns without so much as attempting to take his seat, merely because he spent more than $5,000 on his nomination and election, and the incident is reported with no special prominence! Who would have thought this possible, a few years ago? Whether Mr. Bleakley, of Franklin, Pa., was aware that the Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1910 was being violated on his behalf, or not, does not appear in the brief accounts which the newspapers gave of his trial, but his refusal to fight the matter is significant of the kind of teeth which the law has; especially as it was made at a time when a single vote, for all that any one knew, might have decided the election of Speaker. We are not yet so clear of the taint of huge expenditures in elections as to prevent this occurrence from having force as an example. It ought, indeed, not merely to serve as a warning to aspirants for Congress, but to lead to the extension of the principle to other offices, in connection with which the scandal of a "barrel" is frequently much worse than it is in the case of Congressmen. We should not stop short of the English provision which definitely states that the spending of more than a fixed amount in behalf of a candidate, by himself or anybody else, shall invalidate his election.

IT is gratifying to have from the Provost of the University of Pennsylvania the assurance that the retirement of Prof. Simon N. Patten has no connection with his recent pacifist activities. For a university which declares that it stands for the truth to retire a man because it does not like his views would be a blow to free speech and free conscience in the academic world which would be nothing less than intolerable. Because of his advanced economic views it has been understood that Professor Patten has been *persona non grata* to the authorities at the university for some time past; and it was rumored last autumn that action would be taken as soon as he reached his sixty-fifth birthday. The question whether the authorities have a right to retire him in view of his original contract of April 7, in 1891, which reads that he be "confirmed in the said professorship without limitation of time," will doubtless be settled in court. It is also a case for the Association of University Professors to watch very carefully. However much any one may have disagreed with Professor Patten's economic views, if there is the slightest question of freedom of speech or tenure of contract, it is to the interest of university teachers everywhere that the issue raised shall be threshed out to a finality.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Army Bill

OBVIOUSLY, the army bill transmitted to Congress on Thursday of last week is meant for careful revision. So far as its present form permits one to judge, the immediate recruiting of the regular army and the National Guard to the size contemplated by the Hay law of last year is to be the first step, and, wisely, this is to be done by a call for volunteers. When this is accomplished, there is to be raised an entirely new force of 500,000 men, and these are to be drafted by a selective process, without giving the country a chance to volunteer. Thus, the regular army and National Guard will need about 450,000 volunteers at once to fill the existing regiments and the new ones which the Hay law was designed to raise during the next four years; these are now to be raised forthwith. Then is to come the raising by draft of the special war-time army at 500,000, "or such part or parts thereof as he [the President] may at any time deem necessary." Next the President is to be further authorized, "at his discretion and at such times as he may determine, to raise and begin the training" of still an additional force of 500,000 men, presumably by drafting, though this is not specifically stated (Section 4).

With these provisions no fault can be found save in the matter of the draft. This might become necessary if the war should prove to be unpopular, but since Canada, with her eight millions of population, has raised nearly 500,000 volunteers to oppose the Kaiser, it is to be assumed that the President will obtain all the volunteers he desires, even up to 1,500,000, should he wish them. It will seem to most Americans like a reflection upon the 100,000,000 citizens of this country to assume, as this bill does, that it will be necessary to use the draft at once. England raised fully 4,500,000 volunteers before resorting to conscription. Since President Wilson already possesses the power to draft under the Hay Army law passed last year—although few are aware of this—the new army bill should be promptly amended to permit voluntary enlistments for all the proposed forces.

Volunteering is made the more easy since the War Department's proposal permits the enlistments of men between the ages of eighteen and forty, and, as was the case in 1898, it is specifically stated in Section 6 that all such enlistments in the regular army and National Guard shall cease on the "expiration of the emergency." But the men now enlisted in the National Guard or regular army, whose enlistments will expire before the war is over, will not be permitted to receive their discharges until the conclusion of hostilities. And all men who voluntarily join the colors will be assigned to the regulars or National Guard or any other force not raised by draft to which the War Department may direct them. Registration for purposes of draft is to be upon proclamation by the President, and refusal or neglect to register will be punished by imprisonment for not less than three months nor more than one year. Any person charged with any duty under this act who neglects to perform it, or any one who seeks by fraud to evade any of its provisions, will be imprisoned for not less than six months nor more than one year. There is, it is pleasant to note, a clause exempting objectors to military service because of religious convictions, or membership in an organization whose creed forbids the bearing of arms; but this should be widened to exempt those who can prove their anti-war beliefs, despite the fact that they do not belong to the Quakers or other religious organizations. The four thousand conscientious objectors in England now in jail testify to the need of a broader clause.

The very inclusion of this exemption for Quakers is in itself an argument against the draft features of the bill. What is it that is reported to have won the militiamen who served in Texas to universal military service? Nothing more or less than the feeling that they had "done their bit," and that the other fellow ought to do his. But here is a measure which proposes arbitrarily to take John Smith at 225 West 46th Street and to leave at home John Williams, who lives at 227 West 46th Street. This will not appeal to the American as fair play, and it is, therefore, in our opinion, a mistake to suggest such a policy until it is clearly shown that an army of the size needed can be raised in no other way. Already we have heard of a chilling of the ardor of some who were planning to enlist because of the belief that a service they are glad and willing to give is to be exacted of them by force. If men are driven to service before it is even ascertained that more than 450,000 wish to go, it will give the American response to the President's call a most unhappy look abroad, besides causing great popular unhappiness at home. The Congress will be well advised to amend the bill in this one respect without delay, and all the more readily because the power to draft has already been bestowed upon the President.

Plans for Financing the War

THE announcements from Washington as to the very large scope proposed for our initial plans of war finance have been received by the entire community in a commendable spirit. Both the amount which it is suggested may be raised through sale of bonds and the amount to be raised by new taxation are much greater than had been generally contemplated before war was declared; but we have heard no murmuring against them, even in quarters which would be hardest hit. Wall Street itself, though puzzled as to the influence which unexpectedly high taxes might have on the status of certain investment securities, has professed its entire willingness to bear the burden. Banking houses whose special business is the placing of new bonds with the investing public have come forward instantly to offer their services free of commission or expense in floating the United States loan. What the Government requires in this hour of great events, all classes of the community will give, whatever the individual sacrifice.

As yet, no statement has been promulgated at Washington showing in detail what those requirements are, how they have been ascertained, and in what way the huge new public receipts will be applied. We have so far only the general statement that, according to present expectation, the Administration will ask for authority first to issue $5,000,000,000 bonds, of whose proceeds $2,000,000,000 will be used for the war establishment and $3,000,000,000 for extending credits to the Allies; secondly, to raise through taxes $1,750,000,000. These are wholly unprecedented amounts. If raised within a single twelvemonth, their aggregate would be more than three times the revenue raised through loans and taxes even in the fiscal year 1865, when the Government had more than one million men in the field on one of the widest battle-fronts in history.

Cost of this present war to the European belligerents has

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

created closely similar comparisons with the cost of previous wars. The debate which will arise, when our Treasury gives Congress its detailed estimate of requirements for the war credit, will in part at least converge on the question whether our Government, taking the figures as proposed, would or would not be starting on too large a scale of initial appropriations. We are aware of the argument which exists for providing more rather than less than will be required in a given period; but there are also strong reasons for studying carefully before hand the purely economic effects of assuming at once any burden greater than present paramount needs require.

The first war credit voted to the English Government, after the hasty preliminary measures, was for $1,750,000,000. The British war loans issued in the first twelve months of fighting amounted to $4,500,000,000; they were put out, however, at two separate dates, seven months apart. The total increase in Great Britain's annual tax-roll over that of the year before the war has been $2,000,000,000. The sum of these two items is a little short of the sum proposed in the Washington dispatches for our Government. Even the increased receipts from taxes—which were imposed only at intervals, as it was seen how actual war expenses were developing—exceeded by only about 14 per cent. the suggested revenue from new American taxation.

Now, it is true that the enormous costliness of war is more clearly understood to-day than it was in 1914, or even a year ago; also that the United States is better prepared to sustain such financial burdens than perhaps even England has been. This consideration is to some extent offset, however, by the fact that the British Government, before it began to raise its war loans, prohibited the further use of English capital, except with the Government's consent, for investment in any other securities than war loans. Our case is wholly different. The very fact that London had thus abdicated, for the period of war, its position as the world's money centre threw on American capital a new and immensely heavy burden. Of the $2,925,000,000 capital invested at London in all kinds of new securities during 1916, all but $45,000,000 was placed in war loans.

The ratio was similar in 1915; whereas the American investors, besides financing the very large needs of domestic enterprises, have in the past two years taken nearly $600,000,000 of new securities of neutral foreign countries. This process ought to continue. At the same time, the comparison of England's fiscal war requirements with our own cannot be convincing unless allowance is made for the enormous cost to England of maintaining over the whole world fleets and armies vastly greater than our own contemplated armament, and keeping them supplied for active warfare.

We repeat it, the Government ought to have every dollar that can be usefully employed for our part in the war, including our rightful financial assistance to our allies. Few citizens, we are confident, will resent the personal burden placed upon them. But there are limits beyond which either Government borrowing or public taxation cannot be carried, in a single measure of legislation, without embarrassing the Government's own plans and expectations; and this well-known fact ought to lead to extremely careful and large-minded study of the details of the proposed vote of credit. Happily, it is already sure that the response of the American people to its Government's call for the necessary funds will be the response of a nation convinced of the righteousness of its declaration of war.

Mobilizing the Shipyards

GERMANY'S professed indifference to our entrance into the war is based less upon our military position than upon our lack of shipping. If the war is indeed over before this country can make itself felt, it will not be because our armies will be too late, but because our supply ships will be too late. Germany has staked her all on the chance of starving out England. The most direct reply to the German challenge and the swiftest blow at German confidence is to lose no time in bringing every ounce of American energy to the demonstration that this hope, like so many other promises held out to the German people by its Government, is doomed to failure. Ship construction is as important as recruiting. We must go at the task with the same determination which has witnessed in other belligerent countries the extraordinary development of necessary industries under the stress of the crises. What we accomplished last year under indirect pressure is only an index to what we may achieve in an emergency. In the four years from 1912 to 1915 we built an average of 185,000 ocean-going tonnage. In 1916 the estimated output of our shipyards was about 670,000 tons. This fourfold increase may in turn be quadrupled. Of wooden ships alone the head of the Federal Shipping Board estimates that beginning next autumn we may turn out two and a half million tons a year.

There is all the more reason for putting our full power into ship construction, because we shall be building not only for the war but for after the war. It is the one form of warfare that is an investment instead of a waste. If it be true that Germany's submarine war is dictated by post-bellum considerations as well as by present needs; if one of her objects is so to reduce the merchant fleets of enemies and neutrals as to give German shipping first place in the trade of the world, the obvious reply lies in our own shipyards. The technical aspects of the question are for the experts to determine. While wooden ships are for the moment to the front, there is no reason why skilful management of the steel industry should not produce a notable increase in other tonnage. Thus much should be kept in mind, that the fleet of 3,000-ton wooden freighters advocated by the chairman of the Shipping Board does not mean a motley of makeshift "jitney boats." The loss of a Britannic or a Laconia is a dramatic episode, but the great bulk of the trade of the world is carried in vessels of smaller dimensions. In 1915 the British mercantile fleet comprised 10,218 steamships of a little less than 21,000,000 tons, or an average of 2,100 tons to the ship. These are the humble cargo boats which the submarines have been sinking, and it is upon these small freighters that our efforts should be concentrated.

The war as a whole has taken on the aspect of the world against Germany. The struggle on sea has taken on the form of the shipyards of the world against the German submarine. Berlin's pretension that her U-boats have frightened the neutrals from the sea is false. Norway has been braving the barred zone decrees and paying the penalty. Norway and Japan will be with us in building against Germany. As for England's effort, we may be assured it will increase in spite of other demands on her resources. In the last peace year she built nearly two million tons, a rate she cannot be expected to reach, but which she will probably approach. England's concern, however, is not for

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the immediate future, but for a year from now. She will not be starved in four months, or six, but there will be all the difference in the energy of the Allied warfare as a whole if English anxiety for the future can be mitigated. With the shipyards of the United States mobilizing for future contingencies, the Allies are at liberty to give their full minds to the tasks of the present. Let us not be deceived by German pretensions that England will be forced to her knees before the United States can bring her strength to bear. We have no time to waste, but we have no reason to go at the task in panic. If the Shipping Board's belief that by next autumn we can turn out 200,000 tons of ships a month is realized, the problem will have been solved. The arithmetic of the situation is simple. The U-boats have been sinking half a million tons a month. If England, the United States, and the other maritime nations can replace four-fifths the loss every month, the marginal loss will not be a fatal drain on a world reserve of about 30,000,000 tons.

Other elements than new construction enter into the problem. The utilization of harbor resources to the limit is one of these. It has been pointed out by an English authority that cargo ships spend half their time in loading and unloading. This writer raised the question whether, for the maintenance of England's food supply, an individual's labor could not be more profitably employed in scientifically regulated dock-work than in cultivating the soil, or even in building ships. This phase in turn relates itself to the full utilization of railway facilities. If ship embargoes have produced railway congestion, it is a question whether a wisely regulated railway traffic in turn might not expedite the work of the ports. The whole is a task which challenges American organizing skill, and it is a task that should be attacked at once.

Censorship and Suppression

AMERICANS who believe in fair play and free speech will read with profound regret the news that the London *Nation* has been excluded from the foreign mail. The reason for this we cannot divine. The *Nation* has scrupulously upheld the Government and the war. It is the foremost English radical weekly; its editor, H. W. Massingham, is excelled by no one in his patriotism, and nobody else prior to the war so loyally supported Lloyd George in his various reforms. That he has frequently criticised the Government is true, but what are Americans to think when they learn that Mr. Massingham can hereafter write for his English circulation alone, that he must not be read in the United States, and that this ruling was arbitrarily enforced without warning or consultation? It comes with particularly bad grace at the very moment that the United States is making the supreme sacrifice of war to uphold England.

Indeed, now that we are to be more or less formally allies of Great Britain, her attitude to us ought to be improved in various aspects. Her censors for some time past have been telling us what we ought and what we ought not to read. The *Cambridge Magazine*, the *Labour Leader*, and *Common-Sense* are some of the other publications we are not permitted to see. Similarly, London has ruled that we may not receive any German newspapers, and one protest after another by our State Department has been ignored by the British Foreign Office. Since, we repeat, we are allies, this churlishness ought to stop. If the German press is available in London to English journalists, it ought to be available to American journalists in New York. Indeed, the value of the German papers to us in America has become greater than ever. The British authorities ought to signalize their pleasure at our entry into the war by withdrawing all restrictions upon our mail, notably upon the letters to neutral countries.

What astonishes us particularly about the barring of the *Nation* is the stupidity of it. What must be its effect upon Americans? In a cause righteously conducted it would seem as if any opinion proper for Englishmen to read might be read abroad. If there are warnings to be sounded at home, such as that of a correspondent in the *Nation*, who declared that the enormous and rather chaotic bureaucratic development going on was a greater menace to England than the Kaiser, what harm could there be in letting Americans know about it? If for military reasons that was an improper statement to appear in London, then it should have been and could have been censored. If it rightly passed the censor, why should it not have been permitted to cross the ocean? When the German newspapers were first withheld from us we made various protests to Englishmen of note, only to receive the semi-official reply that it was not proper for Americans to read the German lies lest their anti-British propaganda should succeed!

This whole matter of the censorship and of suppression has now passed for us out of the region of the academic into that of the practical. There are two menacing censorship bills pending in Congress, the passage of either one of which would be most deplorable. This is not because the American newspapers fail to realize the necessity of a censorship on naval and military news. Every reputable newspaper is ready and willing to censor itself. An enactment of some kind is, we presume, necessary in order to prevent infringements by the conscienceless or careless few. But that ought not to be made the excuse for giving undue powers to the President or to any representative of his; and the official bill now pending is so drawn that the power to "prohibit the publication of any or *all* information, facts, rumors, or speculations referring to the armed forces of the Government, materials, or implements of war, or the means and measures that may be contemplated for the defence of the country except when such publication should have been duly authorized," is distinctly conferred upon the President "*whenever in his judgment* the defence of the country or the *preservation of the public peace* requires such action."

To give the President such powers in peace times would be to bestow upon him authority not possessed, if we are correctly informed, by the rulers of England and Germany. It would have enabled him, had it been in existence and had he so wished, to suppress all information as to our pulling down of the Haitian Government. It would have enabled Mr. Roosevelt to suppress all news of the "taking" of Panama, and it opens the door wide to interference with public opinion. Fortunately, the press of the country is awake to the dangers of the proposed legislation and is bent upon obtaining a revision which, while patriotically safeguarding the country, will at the same time maintain that free press which is never more needed than in time of national crisis. Public opinion must not be hampered by lack of legitimate news and criticism, and no honest paper should be denied the mails. Otherwise there will

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

smoulder dangerous fires underneath. Much evil has occurred in Europe since August 1, 1914, because the censorship has not been confined to military news, and has too often garbled the truth.

The Intellectual Mobilization of France

YESTERDAY afternoon, while a belated and unwelcome snowstorm was filling the streets of Paris with mud and slush, impeding traffic by omnibus and tramway, and administering a chill reminder that the coal supply is still straitened, there was enacted at the Sorbonne a scene which, so far as I have observed, has had no parallel in this or any other country since the war began. In the great amphitheatre, crowded to overflowing and with hundreds turned away, the National Federation formed to combat the enemy propaganda in France assembled, in an imposing demonstration, representatives of scores of affiliated organizations, to make, as it were, their common profession of faith in the nation's cause, and to pledge their support until the war should end in victory.

It was a moving spectacle. The President of the Republic, the Premier, the members of the Ministry, the President of the Senate, and the diplomatic corps honored the occasion with their presence. The orator of the day was Paul Deschanel, President of the Chamber of Deputies. A declaration of the terms of peace which must be insisted upon was read by Prof. Ernest Lavisse, eminent historian and member of the Academy. Then, one by one, the spokesmen of the great societies which form the Federation stepped forward and read their several statements. Monsignor Baudrillart, rector of the Catholic Institute of Paris and one of the most distinguished ecclesiastics of France, spoke for the Catholic Committee of Foreign Propaganda; and to the declaration were appended the names of the Cardinal Archbishops of Rheims and Paris, of nine bishops, and of a long list of other noted clergy and laymen. The declaration of the Protestant Committee was read by André Weiss, of the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences; that of the Jews by Professor Lévy, of the Collège de France; that of the Mohammedans by M. Doutté; that of the League of Instruction by A. Dessoye, formerly Minister of Public Instruction; that of the League for the Defence of the Rights of Man by Ferdinand Buisson; that of the League of Patriots by Maurice Barrès, of the Academy. Mme. Jules Siegfried, president of the National Council of Women, spoke for the women of France; the President of the Municipal Council of Paris, for the Council; Louis Barthou, for the fathers and mothers whose sons had died for their country; and Henri-Robert for the liberal professions. The Federation of Industrial, Commercial, and Agricultural Associations was represented by David Mennet, president of the Paris Chamber of Commerce; while Léopold Mabilleau, director of the Musée Social, spoke for a group of social undertakings and workers. When all had finished, M. Viviani, late Premier and now Minister of Justice, summed up the spirit of the declarations which had been made, and accepted and endorsed them in the name of the Government.

Yet what was done with imposing dignity at the Sorbonne was only an illustration, on a grand scale, of what may be seen going on every day in the systematic education of public opinion. However prone to enthusiasm the French temperament may be, there is surprisingly little attempt in France to arouse or cater to the volatile spirit which expresses itself in cheers and songs and parades, and the nourishing of which is often thought indispensable in a democracy. The great organized appeal, rather, is to the intelligence, the knowledge, the serious reflection of the community. Nothing could have been more characteristic of France than that such diverse groups—to quote M. Deschanel, "Protestants, Israelites, Mohammedans, and free-thinkers; members of the learned professions and of the press; farmers, manufacturers, merchants; societies for popular education, for moral education, and for health; social leagues and feminist leagues; societies for military preparation, for gymnastics, and for sport; maritime leagues, munition workers, and mayors of great cities"—uniting to voice their faith in a common cause, should hold their meeting within the walls of a great institution of learning; that the orator of the day should be a public official who is also a leading man of letters; and that the formal declaration of principles should have been framed and read by a professor of history.

It is instructive to note some of the many ways in which the intellect of France is being brought to bear upon the problems of national defence and national success. The Paris daily papers, for example, contain numerous editorials or signed articles—not "letters to the editor," as in the United States—by members of the French Academy, or by men of high standing as scholars, authors, or publicists. M. Gabriel Hanotaux, for example, writes for the *Figaro*, and M. Aulard, the historian, for *L'Information*. M. Maurice Barrès contributes to the *Echo* a long series of articles on religion and the war. M. Josef Reinach, one of the most influential political personages in France, has long done yeoman service in the daily press. It is not alone the fact that the French newspaper "leader" or "body article" has something of the literary quality which every French writer seems infallibly to acquire, that is significant. It is rather the fact that many of the best minds of France, recognized authorities in their several fields, deem it worth while to write for the newspapers, and that the public welcomes what they write.

The monthly and semi-monthly reviews are an even more interesting study. It is no small task to get out, twice a month, such solid publications as the *Revue des Deux Mondes* and the *Revue de Paris*. The former is edited by René Doumic, of the Academy; the latter by Professor Lavisse and Marcel Prévost, both also Academicians. All three are busy men in other than editorial fields and authors of extensive lists of important books. I have been turning the pages of these and other reviews for the period of the war and noting the hundreds of articles, by well-known writers, in which the events and problems of the war are systematically discussed. The widely circulated *Revue Hebdomadaire* publishes in full, among other things, the important lectures on war topics given every week under the auspices of the Société des Conférences. Equally significant, as a social phenomenon, is the fact that the support of the reviews comes almost exclusively from the reading public and not from advertisements. It is with the reviews as it

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is with books: the thing is published, copies are displayed in the book-shops or on the news-stalls, the waiting public buys, and the product of the intellect of France is set going on its mission of education and enlightenment.

I mentioned the lectures of the Société des Conférences. The number of lectures relating to the war, given every week before this and other organizations, is very considerable. The most varied aspects of the one absorbing situation are discussed: the economic resources of France and its colonies, the encouragement of agriculture, colonial policy, submarines and explosives, the employment of women, domestic science, European diplomacy, the rehabilitation of invaded districts, the statistics of population growth. The Academy of Medicine has lately been considering at length the condition of women in factories, particularly in munition works and hazardous occupations, and has framed proposals for the regulation of hours and conditions of employment of women during the period of child-bearing. Scientifically, of course, the value of the recommendations, in all these fields, must ultimately be appraised by experts and tested by experience; socially, it is significant that France expects its medical men, its economists and sociologists, and its publicists to take up such questions and place their conclusions at the service of the state.

Not far from the Place de la Concorde, across the Seine from the Chamber of Deputies, is the Bureau of Information for the foreign press, familiarly known as the "Maison de la Presse," or the "Propaganda." Originally housed at the Foreign Office, and still attached to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the bureau has grown until it now occupies a spacious building of its own. Here, under the able direction of M. Henri Pousot, one finds a notable corps of lawyers, diplomatists, economists, statisticians, and writers, whose business it is to furnish accurate and detailed information, so far as information may properly be made public, regarding the war and the condition of the country. In addition to a voluminous output of bulletins and "write-ups," intended especially for correspondents of foreign newspapers, the bureau is carrying on studies of the economic life of France and of other countries, compiling statistics, conducting investigations, accumulating photographs and documents, and, in general, preparing the data upon which governmental policy may with confidence rely. Here, barring always the necessary restrictions of the censorship, one may bring one's questions and have them answered, verify one's observations by official figures, or correct one's conclusions by study of a large and orderly body of facts. I am impressed by the carefulness and thoroughness of the work, the effectiveness of the organization, and the wide scope of its inquiries; but I am impressed even more by the quality of the men upon whom the state has levied, and who are rendering a patriotic service in ways which to an American journalist must seem excessively modest.

In yet other ways, more or less divergent and unrelated, the intellectual mobilization of France shows itself. A committee on economic organization, representing the "Ligue Française," has just submitted a report outlining a comprehensive plan for the reorganization of public instruction, as a necessary accompaniment of the reorganization of industry which is certain to be necessary after the war. A longer school period, manual training, instruction in domestic science, and the improvement of technical and professional education are some of the directions in which readjustment and enlargement are proposed. A plan for sending to the war areas groups of artists, for a stay of a month or so each, and for a permanent exhibition at Paris of their pictures and sketches, is about to be put into operation. Depressingly young as are many of the men who are now being drawn for military service, the public schools go on their way about as usual, older men taking the places of the younger teachers who have gone to the front. I hope to have something to say later about religious conditions as affected by the war; but there may be noted, in the present connection, various courses of lectures on moral and spiritual aspects of the war which a number of Paris churches have provided, and an unexpected volume of eloquent preaching.

One cannot avoid speculation as to the effect of these multiform activities upon the intellectual attitude of France after the war, and particularly, of course, towards Germany. Professor Lavisse, in the declaration of principles which he read at the Sorbonne, declared that while a peace which should satisfy the demands of right and justice would not be one which would take from Germany the possibility of living, it would and must be one which would take from her the ability to do harm. The other day I asked another eminent professor of modern history, who is also in close touch with the general educational situation, what the outlook was for an intellectual *rapprochement* of France and Germany after the peace. He shrugged his shoulders characteristically, thought for a moment, and then said, in substance: "That, of course, depends upon Germany as well as upon France. We are not fighting German scholarship as such. What we are fighting is certain dangerous and impossible influences and dogmas which have come to control the thought of Germany, and the persistence of which is a menace to the intellectual soundness, as well as to the political peace, of Europe. If Germany shall be found to have retained anything spiritual and truth-loving when the war is over, *rapprochement* will not be impossible, although I cannot say that it will be easy or speedy." The words were significant, not only as coming from one who spoke out of exceptional historical knowledge, but also as suggesting the depths of thought which the war has sounded.

One conviction, at least, with which I came to France I have seen as yet no reason to change; namely, that the war, whatever the particular occasions which attended its outbreak, is at bottom a conflict between irreconcilable theories of civilization and philosophies of life. What has long distinguished French scholarship, for example, is its thoroughness of research, its comprehensiveness of view, its clearness and directness of statement, and its individualistic freedom; and it is essentially the same qualities which, in the singularly large reading public who are cultured without being scholars, characterize the intellectual approach to social or national problems. If it be true that the war is making France, as it seems also to be making England, more truly a nation than it was before, it is also true that the war is coördinating, clarifying, and intensifying the intellectual life of the new nation. It is for this reason that the mobilization of intellectual forces of which I have been speaking constitutes so deadly a foe to German pretensions, and to any suggestion of an inconclusive peace. For France, at least, a peace is unthinkable that does not carry with it the assurance of intellectual as well as political freedom; and it is for that that the best thought of France organizes its strength.

WILLIAM MACDONALD

Paris, March 9

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Romantic Spirit in American Art

ALBERT P. RYDER died on March 28, having just entered his seventy-first year. He was the purest example of the romantic spirit that American art has produced. In his self-chosen solitary life he saw visions more akin to poetry than to painting as our times understand painting. His themes were willingly taken from the poets—Chaucer's Constance alone in a frail boat on a vast sea, Wagner's Rhine Maidens or the storm-driven barque of the Flying Dutchman. At a moment when imitation was the watchword of painting he built up a world of his own the like of which no other eye ever saw. His little pictures loaded and kneaded with colors generally dull in themselves glow with inner light. There are bleak coruscations which recall El Greco and warmer depths that one finds elsewhere only in Rembrandt. The color is simply an index of moods.

It is probable that, being little of a traveller, and in the main more given to contemplation of his own poesies than to analysis of other men's work, he contrived his highly individual style unaided. In any case, the schooling of the National Academy, which he attended for a time, left no imprint on his canvases. Yet his spiritual kinship with such romantics as Delacroix and Monticelli is unmistakable. It is not to belittle him to suggest that he was a sort of Delacroix on a reduced scale. He had the same emotional potency, but keyed on a shorter scale, being lyrical where Delacroix tends to be epic. Ryder was not steadied by the historic sense that was so strong in Delacroix. His interest was not comprehensive, but episodic. He cultivated the small picture as Poe cultivated the short poem. But there never was a more genuine dreamer. No other American painter has been so much at home in the Ivory Tower. No other American painter has given so much of the richness and warmth of revery, and there was some principle of discipline in the man that dictated a unity and simplicity of effect rare indeed among the dreamers. He had that gift of design which lent importance to every subject matter. A hulk on the shingle and a bit of cliff is enough to suggest infinities of adventure. A horse in a stable, a cow in a meadow, becomes a sort of portent. The glamour of such familiar themes is as great as that of the ostensibly imaginative designs, Death on the Race Track, The Temple of the Mind.

Ours has been the heyday of realism and naturally a man of Ryder's inward vision was an exotic. For all that, he had his share of praise. Charles de Kay acclaimed his genius more than thirty years ago, and the broad-minded dealer Daniel Cottier placed Ryder's works in the best collections of this country and Canada. Ryder's slow and intermittent habits of work kept him, except in his later years, never very far from want. But he led the life he liked and gradually acquired an almost legendary fame which was at times embarrassing.

The tragedy of Ryder's career is not in the isolation, which he willingly accepted, nor yet in the relative poverty, which was his chosen estate. It lies rather in a lack of forethought and training which led him to build up his jewel-like fantasies out of bad pigments and destructive vehicles. Many of his pictures are wrecks. Much of his old age was spent in conscientiously restoring the paintings of his youth. Very few of his pictures will carry down to posterity any notion of his genius. This fact is due to no wilfulness of Ryder, but to a general condition. There is no sound tradition of technique in painting to which an imaginative artist may adhere. What traditions there are are calculated for the realist. So if a painter develops a great decorative vein or one of pure lyricism, he has to find his technique as best he may. The result is a painful eclecticism, or letting technique take care of itself. Whistler's case, in the nocturnes, was not so unlike Ryder's, and about half of the nocturnes no longer show Whistler's intention.

So great a name as Ryder justly enjoyed has seldom been gained with so little display of works. It is unlikely that as many as half a dozen Ryders have ever hung together in one gallery. The pictures are widely scattered, and few have followed the official channels of showmanship. Hence his fame is based on the sense of beautiful quality in the few square inches of Ryder's work that any critic will have seen. The project of a relatively complete exhibition at the Metropolitan Museum promises a sensation. If it provides a catalogue of adequate reproductions, the exhibition will do a notable work of conservation. For most of Ryder's work can only be transmitted in reproduction.

So large and lucid was Ryder's power of design that one is tempted to think of him as a great imaginative decorator born out of due time. Yet while it is true enough that the stuff of a great mural painter is discernible in his little pictures, it does not follow that his development was really thwarted. His genius was lyric. He wrought his little designs in the spirit of a sonneteer, glad if, in the precision and perfection of the form and in the exquisite definition of the single theme, there should be some suggestion of surrounding infinities. In American painting, as a complete exemplar of the romantic spirit, he enjoys a very solitary distinction.

FRANK JEWETT MATHER, JR.

The Fleming's Debt to France

MR. RENÉ DE CLERCQ, the gifted Flemish poet and champion, in the front ranks of the Flemish activists, of the cause of Flanders against the Gallophil Belgian Government at Le Hâvre, once wrote a poem "To those at Le Hâvre when they forgot that Flanders also lies in Belgium," in which he said "We are of Teuton, not of Latin stock." A doubtful assertion. Anthropological researches have shown that a large percentage of the population of Zeeland, the Dutch province nearest to Flanders, possesses all the characteristics of the Celtic race, and that the further south one goes this Celtic element increases in strength. The native of Zeeland represents the link type between the Hollander, in whom the Teuton is stronger than the Celt, and the Fleming, in whom the Celt subdues the Teuton. By his inflammable temperament, his spontaneity, his love of music, the Fleming shows himself more closely related to the Frenchman than to the cool, premeditating Hollander. As to race, therefore, the Fleming cannot pretend to be of Teuton stock.

Mr. de Clercq was thinking of the language when he wrote

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

those words. This case is one of many instances that make one realize the difficulty of ever creating peace by giving satisfaction to national cravings. Poets are prone to idolize the language out of which they strike the music of their verse. Their language is their very life, and in it they recognize the sacred stronghold of their people's nationality. But the people itself will instinctively steer clear of this error of mistaking the means of expression for the feeling, the accidental for the essential. Especially in the case of Flanders the language that a poet uses is proved to be a matter of mere accident: Emile Verhaeren did not give a less true expression to the Flemish mind than did René de Clercq. The essence of their poetry is thoroughly Flemish; it is the passionate feeling that makes them brothers, both true interpreters of their common race. And that feeling, expressed by them in different tongues, shows their race's affinity to France. The very spirit of revolt that stirred De Clercq into rebellion against his own Government is a spark of that same fire which the Gallic race of France has ever kept burning on the altar of freedom. He has the mettle of the revolutionary in him, who, unsupported, dared to fight for the cause he has embraced and die its martyr. The German does not rebel, he prefers to obey, obey even where obedience means sinning, and he dies a martyr to his own servility.

But it is not in temperament only that the Flemish resemble the French. Flemish history has, from the earliest days, been bound up with that of France. The southern part of Flanders, Crown-Flanders so-called, was a fief of the French king, and a lively intercourse, both commercial and intellectual, between Ghent and Paris has imbued the civilization of Flanders, from its dawn in the thirteenth century, with the spirit of French life, French sentiment, French manners. Flemish literature of that period is mainly derived from French sources: the poets of the Middle Dutch Reynard the Fox followed and surpassed a French original, and even Jacob van Maerlant, the poet of Flemish democracy and, by his distrust of French expansionism, a thirteenth-century precursor of the modern Flamingants, owes the inspiration of his last and most beautiful poem to the muse of Rutebeuf. And what Flanders learned from France she taught again to Holland. This province, about 1600, became the centre of the commercial and intellectual life of the Netherlands. Dutch literature, rising to the summit of its power in the poetry of Vondel, remained true to the inspirer of its youth. The early career of Holland's greatest poet was strongly influenced by the drama of Garnier and the poetry of Du Bartas; in later life, indeed, he turned for inspiration to the classics, but the generation that was in its prime when Vondel, as a nonogenarian, went to his grave, was again caught by the irresistible power of the poetry that made the reign of "Le Roi Soleil" a lasting glory. Corneille, Racine, and Molière commanded the Dutch stage all through the eighteenth century, and the subsequent popularity of Voltaire and Rousseau still added to the influence of France on Dutch life and letters. The horrors of the French Revolution suddenly broke the charm. France became the land of abomination, atheism, immorality, and Germany was, in her stead, proclaimed the home of social and domestic virtues, innocence, truth, honor, obedience, order. The Dutch were not clearly aware of the loss they had suffered by the loosening of the old tie, until this war forced to the surface of their consciousness the slumbering love for "la douce France."

The Hollander has this advantage over the Fleming, that he can afford to love French language and literature without having to fear any loss to his own speech from the encroachments by the foreign tongue. Dutch is the vehicle of government, of politics, of science, of literature, of journalism, of daily intercourse in all classes of society, whereas the Flamingant has jealously to guard the maintenance of his mother tongue. Thus it happens that the Hollander, though more Teuton than Celt, is more devoted to France than his Flemish brother of a more Gallic temperament. Some time ago this devotion became crystallized in the Society Nederland-Frankrijk, whose aim is to keep alive the newly awakened interest in the artistic and intellectual achievements of the French people, by organizing exhibitions of French arts and crafts, by inviting French scholars and men of letters to come and lecture in Holland, by the performance of French music, and by facilitating the collaboration between French publishers and Dutch booksellers. By thus asserting their admiration for the French genius, the society pays a debt of gratitude to France for centuries of artistic and literary inspiration. However proud of his Germanic mother tongue, the Dutch man of letters realizes that he would never have mastered the art of making it expressive of his highest ideas and his deepest emotions, if he had not been the heir of Latin civilization.

A. J. BARNOUW

The Hague, March 4

Correspondence

WE WHO ONCE WERE PACIFISTS

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: What am I? Last year and even before the fateful 1914, I was a Pacifist, glad to be known by a term not yet recognized by dictionaries, thankful for a word which so exactly defined the vague but earnest ideals that I acknowledged to be mine. I believed that peace was more worthy to be striven for than war. I believed that it was better to fight against hate and brutality and selfish national arrogance than to accept them as an irreducible part of the scheme of things below. I believed in the theory of nonresistance, but not in its practice; since I saw no nation sufficiently heroic to arm themselves with that weapon of the saints. Therefore I believed in force—as a last, imperfect means, to be used when saner methods failed us. Therefore I believed in efficient preparedness—a preparedness nevertheless for ultimate peace, which recognized that hysteric arming, even for defence, inspired fear, and that fear was the mother of warfare. I believed in universal service to the state, of which military discipline and organization should be not the whole but a part. In short, I was a Pacifist, and content with the denomination.

And all this I still believe and hundreds of thousands with me, hundreds of thousands who are preparing earnestly to serve their country in the crisis that is approaching. But what are we?—for the term Pacifist is being torn from us. Pacifist, in the current press, means coward. Pacifist means holding back from war in order to make more money. Pacifist means anarchist, dreamer, traitor to the state. Pacifism is a "poisonous heresy." What rubbish! What dangerous rubbish! Pacifism meant and means nothing of the sort. But if it is too late to complain of the abuse of a noble word,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it is not too late to ask for a more honest description of the hundreds of thousands who think as I do—the one-time Pacifists.

I am in no mood to insult the extremists, for war or against it. I admire the rebel against war, baptized already in fiery ink by the newspapers, later perhaps to be baptized in blood. I admire the non-resistant, the confirmed internationalist, the Christian Socialist, because he is consistent and courageous; because he is fighting on the side of the future, if not of the present. But he seems to me dangerous. Like certain early Christians, he is too anxious for martyrdom—his own and his country's. He comes too soon, except to serve as a light for the future. And the cowards and the slothful and the selfish are too willing to follow his lead.

I admire the combative, the warlike, in this crisis. I approve of the virile impulses that prompt them. I know that in war-time we are fortunate to possess such a stock, to have warriors by temperament, as well as warriors by duty. War is a profession, even if a sad one; and if practiced at all must be practiced with heart and efficiently. But I distrust the fire-breathers among them, the clamorers for blood and iron, the much-talkers of national dignity. They seem to be archaic, hysterical, anti-social, opposed to any hopeful theory of living.

These extremists, as I think, are more deserving of the lash of the press and public opinion than we who once called ourselves Pacifists. For they and their hundreds of thousands do not grasp the real significance of this international struggle. The merely pugnacious would prepare without thinking what kind of a world they prepared for; would die (let us say to their credit) without asking why. And the non-resistant would obstruct preparation for inevitable war without considering the effect of obstruction; would sacrifice safety and dignity and usefulness in the present to a remote, not a realizable, future. How infinitely more important is the status of Western civilization after the war, and all that may make it a sound one, than the satisfaction of the virile instinct to "do something" immediately, whenever national dignity is "offended." And, for the other party, how infinitely more important that Europe should be free from a despotic German hegemony, that wronged races should have their rights, and international decency be vindicated than that here and now we should drop this evil weapon war and be passive to our own and others' undoing! Everything that best makes for equitable peace after the war is right, no matter what distrust of bloodshed and violence may have to be suppressed in the attaining. Everything that leads to "cruel and unnatural punishments" of vanquished races, to triumphs that must breed revenge, seems to me wrong, no matter what traditions of national dignity and righteous indignation may have to be sacrificed in the foregoing. There is only one issue, and that is ultimate peace and the saving of Western civilization.

If to believe in such principles, and to think in terms of facts—the facts of the drift towards peace as well as the facts of existing warfare—makes me a Pacifist, then a Pacifist in thought, if not in name, I intend to remain. For who is not a Pacifist, in my sense, the old and right sense? What American in his cooler moments can fail to be such a Pacifist—except fighters for the sake of fighting, indifferents careless of national welfare, and the few among the many profiting by war who are influenced by the thought of gain? One thing only moves me to give up Pacifism of this breed and turns me towards a private if not public militancy—if I am called unpatriotic by those whose patriotism, so I believe, is narrower and no more intense than my own!

Of course I and the hundreds of thousands who feel in general as I do must compromise, and compromise heavily. My Quaker ancestor who stood aloof throughout the Revolution refused to do so; and I admire his resolution, though not his common-sense. He did not face the facts. He was true to his principles, but did not help to save his country, although in some far-off divine event his obstinacy may have its reward. I hold rather with the Quaker grandfather on the other side who ground flour for the starving army at Valley Forge until the British seized his millstones and wrecked his mills. He broke the great tenet of the Friends—to take no sides in war—but his compromise would have been the least that might be made by a true Pacifist. We were not heroic enough then, or now, to win through by the Quaker's way. We must fight fire with fire—as now in forests and great cities, not willingly, not usually, not stupidly, but as a last determined resort.

Invent a new term, then, for the myriads that call themselves Pacifists; or, if Pacifism is to be a reproach, apply it with discrimination. We will not be confused with the sentimentalists—the non-resistants, or half-resistants, who wish to sell goods to the Allies only and still keep clear of European responsibility. We cannot align ourselves with the reckless barbarians who care not what happens to-morrow so long as they fight to-day. We are a party, patriotic I know, self-sacrificing I hope, clearer thinking than some; a party of protest against prejudice and short-sightedness, rant and hysteria. We are against anti-nationalism and the sluggishness of a people not too cowardly to fight, but too comfortable to think; we are against dangerous jingoism that serves its own passions rather than the state.

H. S. CANBY

Yale University, April 4

MOTLEY ON THE SCHLESWIG-HOLSTEIN AFFAIR

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Apropos of the events leading up to August, 1914, and of our present relations with Germany, I have found the following extracts from John Lothrop Motley's correspondence highly illuminating. While Minister to Austria he wrote to his daughter, April 23, 1866, concerning the Schleswig-Holstein affair as follows: "It is an anxious moment in Europe. . . . Let me epigrammatize in six lines the situation thus far for your benefit."

1864.—Prussia and Austria in the early months make war on Denmark, because Schleswig-Holstein belongs to Mr. Augustenburg.

1864. Midsummer.—Prussia and Austria, having conquered Denmark without allowing the Bund to participate in the war, accept Schleswig-Holstein from Denmark. Mr. Augustenburg fades out.

1865. September.—Prussia and Austria agree at Gastein to have temporary division of the booty. Prussia to have the administration of Schleswig, Austria to administer Holstein.

1866. January 26.—Prussia tells Austria that her administration of Holstein is dangerous to her peace of mind.

1866. February.—Austria replies that Prussia herself invented Augustenburg originally, and that Prussia now had better mind her own business. According to Gastein, Prussia is to administer Schleswig, and has no right to put her nose into Holstein. . . . Prussia lets her passions continue to rise. She says she will and must have Schleswig-Holstein, peaceably if possible, forcibly if necessary, and begins to pre-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pare for a great fight with Austria. Austria meantime makes no preparations to fight Prussia. Prussia, naturally much exasperated at this, makes loud complaint that Austria is getting ready to attack her, and sends word to Vienna, in goading language, to the effect. Austria denies it.

April 5.—Prussia writes word that she knows better.

April 7.—Austria replies that it is beneath her dignity to contradict once more a charge which she has so often contradicted. Nevertheless, pocketing her dignity, she protests solemnly that all accusations that she is arming are contrary to truth, and she calls on Prussia, and this time in bumptious accents, to disarm.

April 15.—Prussia replies acrimoniously that she cannot disarm unless Austria takes the initiative, not believing at all her statements that she has not armed.

April 17.—Bavaria appears on the scene as umpire or judicious bottle-holder, and begs Prussia and Austria to disarm simultaneously.

April 18.—Austria says, "With pleasure," and sends word to Prussia that she will disarm on the 26th of April, if Prussia will follow suit next day, having just stated with perfect truth that she has not armed at all.

P. S. April 24.—Prussia has replied. The note was given yesterday at 2 P. M. Prussia will disarm "in principle," *au fur et à mesure* as Austria disarms.

Now comes a puzzling problem in Rule of Three. Query: Austria not having armed at all, how much disarming will be required of Prussia to equal the promised disarming of Austria? . . . .

I have been ponderously chafing on this subject, my dear child, because I have been boring myself and the United States Department with dreary dispatches on this dreary Schleswig-Holstein *ismus* once a week these three months; and, really, I have not put down in the foregoing pages all that I know or anybody knows on the subject. I have felt all along that there would be war. I still feel so. Everybody else says there will be peace. Nobody doubts that Prussia will get the Duchies, however. . . .

In short, there is mischief brewing. These people have been playing with edge tools ever since the beginning of January, and somebody may get hurt. . . . .

Lord Palmerston once remarked that the Prince Consort was one of the three men who had ever understood this Schleswig-Holstein question, another was a Danish statesman, who had lost his mind, and third was Palmerston himself, who had forgotten it.

The above quotations would seem to indicate that our trained historian and experienced diplomat, the friend and intimate of Bismarck, likewise understood the question and that his interpretation has some significance and value for his countrymen at the present moment.

CHAS. E. PAYNE

Grinnell College, Ia., March 12

A REQUEST TO LIBRARIES

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I am anxious to learn what libraries in the United States and Canada contain Kluge's "Die Schrift der Mykenier," Cöthen, 1897, and shall appreciate it if librarians having the book would drop me a card saying so.

GEORGE HEMPL

Stanford University, Cal., January 10

"TYPE-WRITING"

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The recently issued fascicle of the Oxford Dictionary completing the letter T (*Turndum-Tzirid*) gives 1881 as the date of the earliest recorded use of the word "typewriting." The term is, however, at least two hundred years older. In another sense, of course, and probably as a nonce-word, it occurs in John Wilkins's "An Essay towards a Real Character and a Philosophical Language," London, 1668. It will be found in the "Alphabetical Dictionary" appended to that work, under the word "Transcribe." Not having discovered it in the body of the treatise, I cannot say positively what it means, but interpreted in the light of Bishop Wilkins's "real character," it ought to mean writing in symbols that are expressive of types or classes, as distinguished from writing in word-symbols.

FRED NEWTON SCOTT

University of Michigan, March 8

POETRY OF THE WAR

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your correspondent M. A. A. may be interested in reading Sir Herbert Warren's address on "Poetry and War," printed in England at the Oxford University Press in 1915. Among the "few good poems war produces at the moment" the author cites Lord Crewe's "A Grave in Flanders," lines which "appeared first in the *Harrow School Magazine* and later were given to the world in the *Times*.

HERBERT C. LIPSCOMB

Lynchburg, Va., January 5

BOOKS

The Russia of Yesterday

Russia in 1916. By Stephen Graham. New York: The Macmillan Company. $1.25 net.

FATE has been both kind and unkind to this work. Hardly was it off the press when events took a turn in Russia which in a sense have almost relegated the year 1916 to antiquity. On the other hand, there is much here that makes it easy to understand the sudden overthrow of the autocracy. In any event, Mr. Graham is a charming narrator, whatever his subject or his treatment. His fondness for everything characteristic of old Russia has been abundantly attested, and there is much in the present work to indicate that he views contemporary developments with mixed emotions.

In that remarkable and scarcely read work, "Reflections of a Russian Statesman," by K. P. Pobyedonostsev, formerly Procurator of the Holy Synod of Russia, occur these words:

> What is this freedom by which so many minds are agitated, which inspires so many insensate actions, so many wild speeches, which leads the people so often to misfortune? . . . Forever extending its base, the new Democracy now aspires to universal suffrage—a fatal error, and one of the most remarkable in the history of mankind. By this means, the political power so passionately demanded by Democracy would be shattered into a number of infinitesimal bits, of which each citizen acquires a single one. . . . By themselves individuals are ineffective, but he who controls a number of these fragmentary forces is master of all forces, and directs all decisions and dispositions. . . . In a Democracy the real rulers are the dexterous manipulators of votes, with their placemen, the mechanics who so skilfully operate the hidden springs which move the puppets in the arena of Democratic elections. . . . This history of mankind bears witness that the most necessary and fruitful reforms—the most durable measures—emanate from the supreme will of statesmen, or from a minority enlightened

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by lofty ideas and deep knowledge, and that, on the contrary, the extension of the representative principle is accompanied by an abasement of political ideas and the vulgarization of opinions in the mass of the electors. It shows also that this extension —in great states—was inspired by secret aims to the centralization of power, or led directly to dictatorship. In France, universal suffrage was suppressed with the end of the Terror, and was reëstablished twice merely to affirm the autocracy of the two Napoleons. In Germany, the establishment of universal suffrage served merely to strengthen the high authority of a famous statesman who had acquired popularity by the success of his policy. What its ultimate consequences will be, heaven only knows!

Perhaps we are nearer knowing, but this is by no means certain. Mr. Graham tells us that last year there was a strange silence in Russia. What was before the war had passed; what should be after had not begun to be. There was as yet no promise of the future anywhere. Yet, as he describes the life and thought and feeling of the people among whom he then found himself, a feeling of uncertainty comes over us. He says that an interesting phenomenon in the life of contemporary Russia is the position taken up by Maxim Gorky as a challenger of the national and traditional ideas in Russian life and literature. Gorky has become the spokesman of a considerable number of workingmen and middle-class Russians, but has, at the same time, brought upon his head the wrath not only of old-fashioned people, but of a great number of liberal and progressive thinkers. Gorky says that Russia must cease to be mystical, suffering, melancholy, and must be clear-minded and mistress of her soul. He has raised a question which many Russians are considering for the first time. "The Russia which Gorky attacks," says our author, "is just that which is spiritually interesting to us in England —the mystical and impractical Russia, Russia on pilgrimage, artistic Russia; and that which he wants Russia to be is just what would have least spiritual interest for us—Russia optimistic, cocksure, businesslike, well-dressed, smart, and Western."

In the Caucasus Graham saw many of this class, and in particular persons who had made fortunes out of the war. The emptiness of their gay life was an unpleasant contrast to the realities of the time. They had none of the evidences of cultured Russia. They were not noble or wise, nor were they of the people. They were commercial parvenus full of vanity and self-importance. Yet they said, "We are the people who count in Russia." They ate with their knives, they read Artzibashev, Fonvizin, Verbitskaya, they raised their eyebrows or otherwise expressed their contempt when the real artists of Russia were mentioned. "They are nearest to the class in America that invented the word 'high-brow' and for whom commercial talent must go on manufacturing huge quantities of loathsome 'low-brow' literature, art, music, and drama." This atmosphere, however, is not altogether new to readers of Gogol and others of the earlier school of Russian literature.

Great transitional periods are wont to be vulgar; they give free play to the fundamental instincts. But time usually provides a corrective. Our author frankly declares that he believes in Holy Russia and does not care for anything else. He hates to see her being commercialized and exploited, and to see her vulgar rich increasing at the expense of the life-blood of the nation. He is convinced that the new class of middle-rich coming into being is the worst of its kind in Europe. It is worse than anything in Germany, and it is this class that is beginning to have power in Russia. "It is the green and inexperienced who think that power wrested from the Czar and his court is grasped by the idealists of Russia. It is grasped by the capitalists, and often by the foreign capitalists." Truly a sad state of affairs, but other nations have been through this experience.

It is indeed hard to fit Holy Russia into one's conception of Democratic Russia. What, for example, shall we do with Father Yevgeny? He recounted to Mr. Graham a vision he had when the war broke out. He looked up into the sky and it was filled with little white clouds hurrying southward. They were not clouds, as he discovered later, but the hosts of the angels ranging themselves on the side of Servia to save her from the Austrians. On another occasion Father Yevgeny fell into a trance and saw what he had wanted to see all his life—a vision of the Kingdom of Heaven. His account of it is really very charming.

What, too, has Democratic Russia to offer Nesterov and all that he stands for? Nesterov has painted many a wonderful Madonna and Child, and to-day Russia has a popular war picture done by him. It shows a wounded officer standing beside a Sister of Mercy. The background of the picture is Russia, the green forest of pines and firs, the melancholy, placid lake, the wan, white church with its swelling colored dome. In describing this picture, our author quotes some lines by the poet Khomiakov, concluding with:

> The greatest *podvig* is in patience,
> Love and prayer.

Podvig is untranslatable, "trial" being perhaps the nearest we can come to it in English. It means a noble deed, an act of faith, a noble battle against fearful odds, a great sacrifice or act of renunciation, a shaming of the devil, a bold religious affirmation. Such phrases seem mystical and prettily antique to Western ears. Will Democratic Russia subject them to a similar transformation in Russian ears?

We hasten to add that, though a regretful note is encountered throughout this work, in accord with Mr. Graham's well-known habit of lamenting the disappearance of the mystical in Russian life, there is nevertheless much here which the practical reader will find of uncommon interest. The descriptions of Ekaterina and Archangel are admirable. The world has been waiting for just the kind of knowledge regarding Russia's new Arctic port that Mr. Graham gives us. The harbor of Ekaterina, on which stand the town of Alexandrovsk and the barracks of Semionova, is a queen of harbors, a marvellous natural refuge, certainly no makeshift place. The Russians who live in the north are in raptures over their new port. It is narrated that in the autumn of 1915 Archangel froze unexpectedly early, and vessels that could not discharge there went to Alexandrovsk to wait for the railway. Ekaterina was packed with ships. You could almost step from ship to ship and thus get across from one side of the harbor to another. As there were no rings for the moorings of the ships, there was fear that a storm might arise and the vessels dash themselves to bits against one another. But as it proved, no matter how fierce the tempest raged outside, this virginal harbor was always placid.

In the foregoing we have done scarcely more than stress a few things which the reader will inevitably coördinate with the new democracy. It would be wrong, however, to create the impression that Mr. Graham's latest work is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cast in a political mould. On the contrary, it is for the most part merely a description of certain aspects of Russian life as calculated to please the casual reader as to interest the serious student.

Women, Heroines, and Woman

Regiment of Women. By Clemence Dane. New York: The Macmillan Co.

Mag Pye. By Bettina Von Hutten. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

The Girl. By Katherine Keith. New York: Henry Holt & Co.

The Job. By Sinclair Lewis. New York: Harper & Bros.

SEX occupies a big field in current fiction, but there is another next door to it for what is now generally acknowledged as "the sex." Here we perceive something very different from a manœuvring-ground for that pretty romantic male invention, the "heroine." Here is a tract earnestly and highly cultivated. It yields two crops, grown so close together, to be sure, that the seed often mixes: namely, stories of women and stories of woman (not, one is tempted to say for the sake of clearness, of woman God bless her, but of woman Heaven help us). Several novels of these divers orders are before us, which may conveniently be taken up together.

The motive of "Regiment of Women" is more or less suggested by the motto set upon the title-page. Its source is from John Knox's "First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstrous Regiment of Women," and it reads: "The monstrous empire of a cruell woman we knowe to be the onlie occasion of all these miseries, and yet with silence we passe the time as thogh the mater did nothinge appertein to us." This may puzzle the reader who does not recall what the author might well have reminded him of, that Knox's blast was aimed chiefly at Mary of England and the Queen-Regent of Scotland, and that his "regiment" means "regimen," or régime. More particularly, also, this is a study of the tyranny of woman not over her natural enemy, man, but over victims of her own sex. The scene is an English boarding-school, and the arch-tyrant is a schoolmistress past her first youth, whose thwarted sex finds compensation in the enslavement of her most promising pupils and younger associates. Clare Hartill is a woman of feline and malicious charm. She loves the hunt, and she has a cat's cruel delight in the torture of her prey. Natural force and adroitness have given her virtually supreme authority in a little kingdom which another still rules in name. Under a mask of indifferent frankness, she is past-mistress of feminine chicane. The story has to do with her relations to two girls, a pupil and a teacher. The one is a precocious and lonely child in whom the deadly Miss Hartill deliberately rouses a passionate attachment, and whom she afterward almost as deliberately drives to suicide. The other is Alwynne Durand, a girl of high and generous nature, who remains for a long time under the spell of the enchantress, and whose reason is saved only by the love and firmness of a stout young male. So we leave the tyrant deserted and in no unreal sense forlorn; for she is conscious of her own balefulness, and her morbid need of Alwynne has been more than tinctured with affection. The book's striking merit lies in the extraordinary fidelity of its picture. It does for the English girls' school much what Mr. Walpole's "The Gods and Mr. Perrin" did for the English boys' school. The theme in both instances is the life of the teachers, rather than of the pupils. Mr. Perrin, it will be recalled, was nearly driven mad by the petty irritations of his lot. Alwynne, at her last ditch, explains her condition thus: "It's just the atmosphere, and the awful crowding. Such a lot of women at close quarters, all enthusiasm and fussing and importance. They're all hard-working, and all unselfish and keen—more than a crowd of men would be, I believe. But that's just it—they're dears when you get them alone, but somehow, all together, they stifle you. And they all have high voices, that squeak when they're keenest . . ." A story of women, it is clear, rather than of Woman—hardly more "modern" in substance than "Villette." And there is no denying that in the end Alwynne fairly dodges "the sex" by becoming a heroine.

"Mag Pye" is frankly a story with a heroine, not to say a story with three heroines. Though its time is, or includes, the present, its temper is that of timeless romance. A lady with a window-smashing hammer appears among the supernumeraries, young Mag Pye smokes her cigarette on occasion, and the later scenes have the war for a remote background. But the tale itself, the people, refuse to be brought up to date or tied down to a date. The atmosphere and the machinery are not unlike the late William De Morgan: they are totally unlike the instant H. G. Wells. As in most of De Morgan's stories, the present action hangs upon a past action concerning which there is a mystery to be solved only in the concluding chapter. As with De Morgan also, the apparently careless and haphazard manner of its telling veils an adroit and intricate method. The supposed story-teller is an elderly bachelor and barrister of the Temple, with no briefs, a tolerable income, and a vast interest in other people. He has a hopeless passion for the lady who may be called heroine No. 1, whom he always speaks of as "my beautiful Edith." He in a way adopts the girl Margaret Pye, heroine No. 2; and he is a devoted friend to "Madame Aimée," heroine No. 3. The beautiful Edith, to her own undoing, has banished her lover for a single act of perfidy which he has repented of and wishes to atone for. Madame Aimée. . . . But, as we have suggested, much of the story's interest lies in its element of romantic mystery, and we recall being bitterly reproached in the past for giving away this kind of show. Therefore we must be content with saying that it is a very graceful and skilful story, full of feminine sweetness and good-will towards a race of men, who, on the whole, deserve kindness and sacrifice, and repay them with devotion.

Feminine sweetness and sacrifice are, according to advanced theory, virtues which have been considerably overworked and which now ought to give place to the more rugged virtue of self-expression, not to say self-assertion. The central figure in "The Girl" is sufficiently romantic by nature, but time and change have forbidden her the comfortable rôle of "heroine." Modern airs reach her through the discreetly veiled windows of her genteel upbringing. She is not content to be "finished," to "come out," and to complete her career by making a match. She must be herself, do her turn, live her own life. But alas,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

what is her own life? She cannot find out, she can only feel that it ought to be something original and momentous. Therefore her story is a story of restless groping for justification of her egotism. She is not able to lose herself in a passion or a "cause" outside herself. Vaguely longing to rise by her own effort, she cannot even find the bootstraps to tug at. And behind all her nervous occupations, there is the elder preoccupation of sex to which sophistication merely closes a simple and wholesome outlet. It is a book of ingrowing emotion, of strained and hectic self-consciousness, of feminism in its aimless and sterile phase. It is also consciously and deliberately "literary." Some of the material was printed in the *Atlantic Monthly*, and introduced by the editor as "a personal revelation such as we believe has not appeared in print for many years." Yet one would have said that in recent years there has always been a Bashkirtseff or a Mary McLane in the offing.

"The Job" is an earnest and sincere document in favor of independence and self-expression for women. The author is not at all concerned to conceal his purpose, nor does he hesitate, when the spirit moves, to drop the rôle of story-teller and lecture us on woman's wrongs, new methods of business, and what not: he has strong convictions, and does not mean to lose a chance of "getting them across." Often it is very good lecturing: "So long as capital and labor are divided, so long as the making of munitions or injurious food is regarded as business, so long as Big Business believes that it exists merely to enrich a few of the lucky or the well born or the nervously active, it will not be efficient, but deficient. But the vision of an efficiency so broad that it can be kindly and sure, is growing—is discernible at once in the scientific business man and the courageous labor-unionist."

As for the special theme of Mr. Lewis's story, it has to do with a girl who finds her way slowly to successful womanhood against the obstacles set for all her kind by the conditions of American life. We are always hearing the story of the girl who flees from the deadly narrowness of her provincial town to make her fortune in New York. Una Golden does that, bringing with her a little money and a silly and parasitic mother. But Una does not set out upon the way of pleasure and marry the young millionaire; there is not money enough for that. She enters a business college, becomes a stenographer, then a secretary, then a real-estate manager, and finally a power in the "hotel business." Meanwhile she has her inevitable experiences with men. She gives her heart to a brilliant and unstable young journalist who will not marry her because he has not yet "found himself," and who presently goes West and leaves her forlorn. So she marries a vulgar and feeble-souled though good-hearted drummer. She endures him for a long time, and even supports him when he temporarily goes under; but the moment he is on his feet again, she leaves him. By this time she has made her place sure in the world of men, and is able to enter into a self-respecting marital agreement with the long-lost journalist, now restored to her by the kind arm of coincidence. One may discern here a sermon preached, a plot more or less arranged. But there is no escaping the sincerity and originality of the central portrait. As a person, theories apart, Una Golden rings true.

The Middle Ages in Epitome

Dante. By C. H. Grandgent. New York: Duffield & Co.

PROFESSOR GRANDGENT'S book is one of a series edited by G. R. Noyes and W. M. Hart presenting "Master Spirits of Literature"—Dante, Cervantes, Shakespeare, Tolstoy, Virgil, Molière, Homer, Goethe. The treatment of Dante is so defined in a measure beforehand. Doubtless, Professor Grandgent would allow Dante to be a "master spirit" for all time, but he is discussing him here as the "master spirit" of the Middle Ages. Accordingly, he would show the civilization of the Middle Ages as reflected in the many-faceted mirror of Dante's personality and writings. He treats in rapid summary the main aspects of this mediæval civilization, its society, its politics, especially as hinging on the great issue between Church and State, its poetry and prose, its theology and science, its outlook and temper. Then upon each category he quotes Dante. An opening chapter on Dante's life and a final one on the "Divine Comedy" frame the whole work.

It is a wide-ranging design to be compassed within a small book. Manifestly, the treatment must be summary indeed. But one feels the sureness and breadth of scholarship behind, and no informed reader is likely to mistake the summariness for superficiality. At the same time, by the very nature of the case the book is perhaps more immediately valuable as a suggestive introduction to the study of the Middle Ages in general than for its intensive contributions to our knowledge of Dante. Also, it may be that Dante is obtruded rather more prominently than right perspective would justify. "I have attempted," says the author, "to trace a portrait of the Middle Ages with Dante's features shining through." In any such two-in-one picture there is danger of the one "spirit" portrait a little blurring the other. Admittedly, Dante "does represent his time as no other age has ever been represented by any one man." But after all "any one man" can express a complex period of history in only a very small way. Indeed, if Dante was the "master spirit" of the Middle Ages among individuals, yet it was neither he nor his people, the Italians, but the French who were collectively in a vastly larger sense the master spirits of the epoch. The lay reader might hardly gather as much from Professor Grandgent's book. The fault is not his, but of his hero-centric method.

So far as he allows himself range, Professor Grandgent handles the large issues of Dante scholarship with convincing clarity. In a page he resolves the enigma of Beatrice, theme of such vast and subtle argumentation. He compares Dante's worship of her with our American veneration of the national flag. All our patriotic sentiments have come gradually to be associated with a piece of colored bunting, pretty as an object, but sacred as a symbol. "We have proceeded from the abstract to the concrete; Dante naturally moved in the opposite direction. Suppose a fanciful child, as he watched a banner fluttering in the breeze, had thought it the loveliest thing in the world, had convinced himself that to stand gazing at it or to do it service was the only genuine happiness; and then, as he grew older, had little by little come to look upon it as the embodiment of fatherland: that would have been Dante's course" (p. 6). One can only wish that Professor Grandgent had not stopped where he did, but had given his idea more range and development. For the dictum that Dante naturally moved from

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the concrete to the abstract is a key to more than his progressive allegorization of Beatrice. It is the key to his allegorical method itself. His was a realistic allegory, no mere veiling of abstract truth behind the veil of a "pleasant fiction," but an educing of truth latent in actuality, an explication of the *verbum in mundo*. Having this in mind, we may read with richer understanding the immediately following explanation of the "New Life." "The basis is a series of real experiences, interpreted, however, in accordance with his maturer thought and with a certain preconceived purpose" (p. 7). That purpose—the truth latent in the actuality of his amorous experiences, though only retrospectively realized—is to show the constant and miraculous leading of his lady as truly his "kindly light," veritable ray of the Light of the World, Christ. This half-esoteric significance is apparently implied in Professor Grandgent's words, but he is forced by the swiftness of his survey to move on before he can make his full meaning explicit.

This self-imposed brevity is least restrictive in the admirable chapter on the Mediæval Temper, which mainly concerns itself with Dante's own temperament. By pithy suggestion, aptly illustrated, we are made to realize Dante's expressive sensitiveness to nature in all her moods, to the comedy and tragedy and farce in human lives, to the whole range of human emotions and affections. We are shown unexpected tendernesses in the sombre poet. "Where can we find greater delicacy of feeling than in his unwillingness to walk in staring silence past a row of souls which, temporarily blinded, cannot return his gaze?" (p. 313; cf. "Purg.," xiii, 73-5). Again, "Dante loved children. In the vast amphitheatre of Paradise he reserves the whole lower half for those who died before they had an opportunity to exercise free will. Now, current opinion, as expressed in art and writing, even in the teaching of St. Thomas, held that resurrected bodies shall appear in the semblance of the prime of life. In the stone carvings which on the front of so many churches depict the Judgment Day, the figures are all of the same age, neither old nor immature. Yet Dante chose to keep for his celestial babies the heavenly charm of babyhood. He could not forego the spectacle of a countless host of tiny boys and girls, all chirping with innocent joy" (p. 316; cf. "Par.," xxxii, 43-8).

In the chapter on Theology, on the other hand, excessive brevity results in a certain inadequacy. For instance, the discussion of Dante's solution, or attempted solution, of the problem of evil rather puzzles than clarifies. "To say that the world, to be perfect, must contain all that is possible, and therefore all possible degrees of good and evil, may stop the mouth of the questioner, but cannot appease his mind" (p. 185). It is not quite clear whether this view, presented to be so dismissed, is to be understood as Dante's. There is imputed to him a resolution putting the blame on the stars: "They are imperfect because they are made of matter, which, being base, cannot completely realize the divine purpose. But," continues the author, "inasmuch as matter was created by God, and every direct product of God's energy is perfect, the contradiction still remains." Professor Grandgent further continues: "The presence of sin is explained thus. The Almighty's object in creating was to bring into independent existence other beings which should share his happiness. But there can be no independent life, and no individual happiness, without freedom of the will; and this freedom means liberty of choice between good and evil" (p. 186). But this last justification for the presence of evil in a divinely ordered world would seem to be just what we—and Dante—have been seeking. The world must contain "all possible degrees of good and evil," not indeed for its own perfection, but for the perfecting of the morally free agent, man. Professor Grandgent's statement that "matter" is a "direct product of God's energy" also, it would seem, needs qualification. God-created matter is perfect *matter*, just as Adam, created directly by God, was perfect *man*. But neither first matter nor first man is unqualifiedly perfect. Only God himself is that. On the contrary, matter is lowest in the scale of relative perfections, because the highest perfection implies the highest actuality, whereas first matter is by definition the absolute absence of actuality, or pure potentiality. Indeed, a phrase on p. 196 would indicate that sharp distinction is perhaps not maintained between "matter" in the metaphysical sense and material as commonly understood. Professor Grandgent says: "When the world was fashioned, three factors sprang into existence simultaneously: crude matter, the skies with their stars, and the angels." Dante certainly appears to give grounds for this statement (cf. "Par.," xxix, 22 ff.), yet he cannot have been guilty of positing independent existence, *i. e.*, actuality, to what is *ex hypothesi* the negation of actuality. But the problem is a difficult one. Only it is clear that Professor Grandgent's simple and categorical statement must have an illusive finality.

Another statement in the same chapter is open to question. "The torments of Purgatory," we are told, "unlike those of Hell, have a reformatory purpose" (pp. 191-2). A "reformatory purpose" would naturally imply for its result a moral improvement. But Purgatory, being beyond the sphere of temptation (cf. "Purg.," xi, 22-4), is beyond the sphere of morality itself. The punishments of the Mount are not reformatory, but are in the nature of a fine or forfeit for sins unexpiated in life. In principle, therefore, purgatorial punishments are exactly like infernal, except that they are temporary and not eternal. Indeed, were they reformatory, how absurd were it to keep the late-repentant waiting a long time before beginning self-reform.

Professor Grandgent's partisanship for the age he is describing adds vivacity to his treatment. His book is full of witty and sarcastic jibes at complacent modernity. For instance, of "current impressionistic doctrines," he remarks: "The philosophy *à la mode* would have appeared to St. Thomas like a puppy that runs after every stranger it meets, thinking it may have found its master. Every uncouth thing that shocks the sense, if it but present itself with due solemnity, we are ready to receive as perhaps representative of the science, religion, or art of the future, no matter how ridiculous, how wicked, how hideous it may look. We have thrown our compass overboard, and are now drifting hither and thither as purposeless as the time-servers in Dante's Infernal Vestibule. Like Celestine V, whose pusillanimous renunciation of the Papacy in 1294 gave the throne to the unscrupulous Boniface VIII, we seem to have made the 'great refusal' of responsibility" (p. 281). Such doses of pride's purge are wholesome.

Not the least interesting feature of this interesting book is the considerable body of original translation in the original metres. On the whole, Professor Grandgent's renderings, while scrupulously faithful, are idiomatic and racy, at times of rare felicity. Especially good is his version of the realistic-comic episode of the Navarrese barrator outwitting the devils (pp. 332-8).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Light on Defoe

Daniel Defoe: How to Know Him. By William P. Trent. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co. $1.25 net.

THE plan of the series to which this is the latest addition —a plan now sufficiently clear from Prof. Bliss Perry's "Carlyle," Professor Phelps's "Browning," and other volumes—makes Defoe a highly suitable author to be included. Few important writers have been so prolific, of few is the greater part of their work less accessible, and to few is greater injustice done by remembering only their best-known books. In Defoe's case there are additional difficulties of chronology, authorship, and sources which can be elucidated only by great skill and patience. For this task no one else is so competent as Professor Trent, who has for years been engaged upon an exhaustive study of Defoe's life and works, and whose brief articles in the *Nation* and in the "Cambridge History of English Literature" have both enlightened and tantalized us.

The present volume rather closely follows the general outlines of the chapter in the "Cambridge History" (Vol. IX, Chap. I), except that it is fuller, rather more popular, and in some cases built upon revised opinions. Though purposely neglectful of bibliography, it provides a liberal body—something like two hundred pages—of well-chosen passages from Defoe's works, many hardly to be found except in very large libraries.

In the light of Professor Trent's narrative the activity of Defoe seems more wonderful than ever. New details are given concerning his career down to the death of Queen Anne, and his work between 1714 and 1718 is shown both to have been far more considerable than used to be supposed and to have foreshadowed more directly and significantly the better-known narratives of his later years. Some of the evidence in this latter regard—that, for example, of the "Continuation of the Letters Written by a Turkish Spy" (1718)—is little known and decidedly important.

The old notions that the "True Relation of the Apparition of One Mrs. Veal" is anything but true, that the "Journal of the Plague Year" cannot have been based on any personal recollections, and that in general Defoe was an unexampled liar, are more effectively set aside than before: Professor Trent's unequalled knowledge of the chronology and sources at once diminishes Defoe's "reputation for splendid creative mendacity" and leaves "abundant reason for praising his extraordinary faculty for giving lifelikeness to his narrative and descriptive writings."

It would be difficult to find a writer whose forgotten work is better worth reading than Defoe's. Much of it fairly amazes us by its application to our own times. "On every side Europe is afflicted, plagued, harassed, and ravaged by the war, and yet sees no end of her sorrows." So it was in 1711; so it is to-day. And much of what Defoe wrote about charity, the servant problem, and education is as profoundly if not as startlingly true. The general reader, who probably comes to Professor Trent's volume with the idea that Defoe is little more than the author of "Robinson Crusoe," is in for a highly illuminating experience. The scholar, now realizing more than ever that Defoe is "a man whose biography needs several large volumes for adequate treatment," will await Professor Trent's final work with increased keenness.

Notes

PUBLICATION of "Second Youth," by Allan Updegraff, is announced by Harper & Brothers for April 19.

"Education and Living," by Randolph H. Bourne, will be published shortly by the Century Company.

Frederick A. Stokes Company announces for publication during May "A Munster Twilight," by D. Corkery; "Our Part in the Great War," by Arthur Gleason, and "Open Boats," by Alfred Noyes.

The following are among the publications of D. Appleton & Company for April: "Enchantment," by E. Temple Thurston; "McAllister's Grove," by Marian Hill; "Women and Work," by Helen Marie Bennett; "Town Planning for Small Communities," by Charles S. Bird; "Municipal Functions," by Herman G. James; "An Introduction to Social Psychology," by Charles A. Ellwood; "Mental Adjustments," by F. Lyman Wells; "A Scale of Performance Tests," by Rudolf Pintner and D. G. Paterson; "Dance Music and the Whole World Plays," by Albert E. Wier.

FORTHCOMING publications of Columbia University Press are as follows: "The Mystic Vision in the Grail Legend and in the Divine Comedy," by Lizette Andrews Fisher; "English Domestic Relations, 1487-1563," by Chilton Latham Powell; "Sanskrit Poems of Mayura," by G. Payn Quackenbos; "Muhammedan Laws of Marriage and Divorce," by Ahmed Shukri; "French Criticism of American Literature," by Harold Elmer Mantz; "The Early Life of Robert Southey," by William Haller; "Columbia University Contributions to the History of Ideas," by Members of the Department of Philosophy; "The Problem of Space in Jewish Medieval Philosophy," by Israel Isaac Efros; "The Unmarried Mother in German Literature," by Oscar H. Werner; "The Spirit of Protest in Old French Literature," by Mary M. Wood.

Harvard University Press will publish the following books during the present month: "Euthymides and His Fellows," by Joseph Clark Hoppin; "Three Great Congresses of the Nineteenth Century, and Claimants to Constantinople," by Charles Downer Hazen, William Roscoe Thayer, Robert Howard Lord, and Archibald Cary Coolidge; "Essays in the Earlier History of American Corporations," by Joseph Stancliffe Davis; "Calculus of Variations," by William Elwood Byerly; "State Sanitation: A Review of the Work of the Massachusetts State Board of Health," by George C. Whipple; "The Religious History of New England," by J. W. Platner and others; "The Pauline Idea of Faith in Its Relation to Jewish and Hellenistic Religion," by William Henry Paine Hatch; "Business Statistics," edited by Melvin Thomas Copeland; "Waiver Distributed," by John S. Ewart.

A STUDY of "John Davidson," offered by Hayim Fineman to the University of Pennsylvania for the doctor's degree, has the double merit, rare in such theses, of being written in good English and of showing some sense of human philosophy. The little book would never be detected as a doctorial task were not the fact given away on the title-page. Mr. Fineman would have made a more useful book if he had quoted more freely and removed a few redundancies from his criticism. He also might have been more ex-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

plicit in pointing to the differences between Davidson's later philosophy and Nietzscheism. After all, would it be too much to say that the real tragedy of Davidson's life was his desperate and not entirely sucessful endeavor to think?

A FIRST volume of poems in stately folio with original illustrations is at least a novelty. It is what James H. Worthington offers us in "Sketches in Poetry, Prose, Paint and Pencil" (Lane; $15). The verse is mildly erotic, the prose mildly cynical after Oscar Wilde's leading. Affectations are the omission of punctuation, and the inclusion of the places where the poem was conceived. Mr. Worthington has carried his questioning wistfulness pretty much around the world, and the poetic result is genuine enough, with a pathos of delayed adolescence about it, and not much else to commend it. Robert R. Baker's illustrations are on the whole more notable than the text they accompany. These are mostly nudes in red chalk, drawn with considerable nervous power. He has seen his Blake through the "Yellow Book," and withal has something of his own to contribute. The book is beautifully printed on Fabriano paper, and the photogravure plates of the finest. The impression is limited to 300 copies, and the appeal to any bibliophile whose taste was formed in the "naughty nineties" is indisputably strong.

"ESSAYS on Art," by Max Weber, is a well-printed pamphlet with a Post-Impressionistic cover device, published by L. J. Gomme ($1.25 net). Mr. Weber is best known as a modernist painter of baffling versatility. The title-page declares him also the author of "Cubist Poems." The style of the book is a very odd blend of the conciseness of Emerson with the cloudiness of Guillaume Apollinaire and the child's patter of Gertrude Stein. The doctrine, so far as it may be spelled out, is very close to the *Einfühling* of Lipps, upon which is superimposed a theory of progressive revelation through taste. A quotation will represent the style and teaching, and will reveal the taint of eccentricity which pervades the essays:

> To touch matter through sight, to color the invisible with memory of the visible, to hear through touch, to see through imagination, to prophesy or to evoke through memory; thus to interchange the functions of the senses in the process of perception while enlarging the spiritual range of the senses is the most real function of spirit. To thus personify matter with one's senses, embodying the inanimate with spirit is a sacred function—the piety of art.

This is a pretty striking counsel of that unlimited *Anderstreben* which is the specific ailment of modern art.

UNDER the title "The Revolution in Virginia" (Houghton Mifflin; $2 net), Prof. H. J. Eckenrode has composed not only a monograph of exceptional merit, but an excellent illustration as well of the kind of work which, when it shall have been done with equal thoroughness for other colonies and States, will make possible the rewriting of the history of the American Revolution. Based chiefly upon the original sources in the archives department of the Virginia State Library, the work sketches the early controversies over taxation and the trade laws, immediately following the Seven Years' War, and traces with accumulating detail the growth of the radical party in Virginia, the sharp struggle with Governor Dunmore, the organization of colonial resistance through county committees and the Committee of Safety, and the administration of State affairs during the active period of military operations. Where much is new and all is well done, selection of episodes for special commendation is somewhat arbitrary; but the reader who is concerned more with the general course of the Revolutionary movement than with the incidents peculiar to Virginia, or with the origins of political controversies commonly studied only in the constitutional period, will find particular interest in Professor Eckenrode's handling of Patrick Henry's early career, and of the rise of Jefferson as a Democratic leader notwithstanding his unhappy experience as Governor. Of all American statesmen who have "come back," none presents so striking an instance of rehabilitation as Jefferson. The account which Professor Eckenrode gives of the loyalists also adds a good deal to what is already known of that subject. A curious slip (p. 15) assigns the Declaratory Act of 1766, in which the right of Parliament to tax the colonies was for the first time formally asserted, to 1764, the year preceding the Stamp Act, and makes the declaration an important element in the opposition of Virginia to the stamp duties.

IN "Manhattan, 1624–1639" (privately printed, 90 West Street, New York; $10), Mr. Edward Van Winkle, recording secretary of the Holland Society of New York, deals with two important documents of early New York history. One, and the more important, is a map of "Manatus" by Joan Vingboom, 1639, a cartographer of Amsterdam, who made many maps for the Dutch West India Company. His map of "Manatus" includes the Island of Manhattan, together with the adjacent parts of Westchester and Bronx Counties, the western end of Long Island, Sandy Hook (Sant Punt), the Atlantic Highlands (Hoogen Hoeck), Staten Island, and the Jersey shore, including the lower valleys of the Hackensack and Passaic Rivers. It measures 26.625 by 18.25 inches and is handsomely drawn and colored by hand. It contains an inset in which are located forty-five farms, or *bouweries*, of the early settlers. It is here reproduced in a photographic facsimile, and also on linen in the same size as the original. In the latter form the names, as well as the matter in the inset, are translated into English by Mr. Dingman Versteeg, library clerk of the Holland Society. This map was long lost to the learned world. More than fifty years ago it came into the possession of Henry Harisse, who did not permit its reproduction during his lifetime. After his death it passed by bequest into the Library of Congress in 1916 and is now printed for the first time. Mr. Van Winkle has added full and valuable notes on the *bouweries* mentioned by Vingboom, as well as notes on the Indian houses, Fort Amsterdam, the grain and saw mills, and the quarters of the blacks which were situated on Manhattan opposite Blackwell's Island. The editor's commendable devotion to early New York history is not lessened by the fact that at the time of going to press the Vingboom map was also announced for publication in I. N. Phelps Stokes's "Iconography of Manhattan Island." The second document in this book is described as the Van Rennslaer manuscript. It is a statement drawn up by K[iliaen] Van Rennslaer in Amsterdam during 1631 giving the numbers of mares, stallions, cows, bulls, and sheep then on eight specified *bouweries*. The manuscript is given in facsimile and also in translation. As it refers to farms not mentioned in Vingboom's map, it makes a valuable supplement to that interesting document.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THAT architecture is not a simple art, but something Protean in its varied aspects; that it is not merely "good building touched with beauty," but more than this an art whose roots penetrate to the deepest springs of life, whose practice demands prolonged study and discipline, and whose principles are intertwined with mystic numbers and the fourth dimension—such is the impression one receives from "Six Lectures on Architecture" published by the University of Chicago Press ($2). These lectures, two each by Ralph Adams Cram, Thomas Hastings, and Claude Bragdon, were delivered in 1915 at the Art Institute of Chicago on the Scammon Foundation. They are well worth reading as examples of three wholly different attitudes and methods of approach to the subject. Whether designedly so planned or not, they may be considered as devoted respectively in pairs to the past, the present, and the future of the art. Mr. Cram's two lectures discuss the beginnings and the culmination of Gothic art from the point of view of a convinced mediævalist; Mr. Hastings expounds architectural composition and modern architecture from the point of view of the practicing architect trained in the Paris school; Mr. Bragdon, writing as a transcendentalist, in a half-mystical vein, of organic architecture and the language of form, derives from recondite considerations the principles which should control the architecture of the future. Mr. Cram, with his well-known facility of eloquent phrasing, exalts the culture of the Middle Ages in contrast with all modern civilization, which he condemns as wholly lacking in culture. Mr. Hastings, on the other hand, glorifies the Renaissance of which we are the heirs, and the French school as having taught us the fundamental art of artistic planning. Mr. Bragdon divides all architecture into the "organic" and the "arranged"—a rational and suggestive classification when properly understood. Less convincing, though more entertaining, is his effort to apply to architectural form the laws of mystic numbers and magic squares, and his own devices of "projective ornament" and "four-dimensional geometry." The minds of auditors who heard all six lectures must have been left at the end in a somewhat bewildered state, for the book is full of contentious and provocative suggestions. It is hardly milk for babes in architecture, but it is good reading for those who are already somewhat instructed in the subject, and may well set the mature architect to thinking. It is well printed, though not quite free from errors of proofreading.

IT is estimated that over seven hundred million dollars are spent every year in the United States in commercial advertising. Ubiquitous and inescapable, the products of this astounding outlay afford a wide and interesting field of study from many points of view. In recent years the field has been entered by the scientific psychologist, partly in the interest of psychology, partly, and most ostensibly, in the interest of the advertiser. The advertiser wants to make his advertising "tell," or, as he sometimes elegantly expresses it, "pull trade"; the psychologist, seeing in the advertisement a case of the relation of stimulus and response in the human organism, tells him how to do this by bringing to bear on the problem his own expert knowledge of both the general and the special conditions under which this relation is effective. One of the best and most complete treatises on the subject written with this end in view is "Advertising and its Mental Laws," by Henry Foster Adams, instructor in psychology in the University of Michigan (Macmillan; $1.50). The book contains a whole system of psychology and a very extensive record of relevant observations and experiments represented in the form of statistical tables and graphs. Much of this has considerable value for the psychologist. Unfortunately, while laboratory tests with college students as subjects are capable of some degree of mathematical precision, they are seldom adequate for accurate business measurements, and the psychologist, as a rule, is only too pleased to find that his results agree approximately with those obtained in the business world. The art of advertising certainly cannot be reduced to rules. The relation of science and art is here, as elsewhere, reciprocal, but it is a matter of doubt whether the science is not more largely indebted to the art than the art can ever be to the science. However, the business man who is not deterred by the technicalities will find much in Dr. Adams's book that is instructive, and he can hardly rise from its perusal without respect for the minute care expended by the psychologists on the examination of the problem, or without a deepened impression of the complexity of the factors that enter into it.

"THE Treatment of Infantile Paralysis," by Robert W. Lovett (Philadelphia: Blakiston; $1.75 net), is an excellent treatise that has been called forth by the great prevalence of infantile paralysis in America since 1907. It has for its object the correlation in one volume of the old and new views concerning the treatment of the deformities following the acute phase of the disease. Two chapters are devoted to pathology, symptoms, and types of the acute disease and to a discussion of diagnosis, prognosis, treatment, and mortality in this period. The rest of the book (125 pages) is given over to the problem of convalescence and the treatment of the residual paralysis. All this is done in a practical elementary way and, although operative treatment is discussed, no attempt has been made to write an operative surgery. The author, as a result of his vast experience, believes that operative treatment should not be undertaken until at least two years after the acute onset, and he therefore emphasizes the value of muscle training during the early period when the greatest progress is to be expected from non-operative measures. The distinctions as to the character of the treatment are accentuated by recognizing three phases of the disease—the acute, the convalescent, and the chronic—each of which is discussed separately, as is also operative treatment and muscle training. An interesting chapter is that dealing with a new method —the spring-balance muscle test—of determining quantitatively the degree of loss of muscle strength, and of measuring the improvement, or the reverse, in such power, at various intervals during the treatment. As most of the advances in the treatment of this disease exist almost wholly in the fugitive periodical literature, and have not yet found their way into textbooks, the appearance of Dr. Lovett's volume, which coincides with the subsidence of the greatest epidemic of infantile paralysis this country has experienced, is most opportune.

THERE is a time-worn joke that whales form an excellent topic with which a diffident man may begin a conversation, as it is impossible to dispute any assertion that he may make about them. But the recent publications dealing with whales are rapidly adding to our knowledge of these strange creatures. The most recent monograph, summing

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

up our knowledge of the "Whalebone Whales of New England" is by Glover M. Allen (Boston Society of Natural History). Seven species are included, such as the Right Whale, the Rorqual, Finback, the Blue, and the Humpback. The natural history is covered as thoroughly as our present knowledge permits. The history, beginning with the relations with the American Indian and extending through the rise, glory, and decline of the great whaling decades of New England, is continued up to date. The monograph is an excellent résumé of the human record of these cetaceans, but no facts of an unusual nature are elucidated. One is struck by the reiteration, throughout all the accounts of all the species, of the invariable affection shown by the mother whale for her offspring. Whalers never fail to harpoon the young one first, in this way making certain of the parent, for neither alarm nor pain will induce her to leave the youngster, even after he has been slain. A discussion of the question of Jonah and the whale presents the various possibilities of the animal concerned as being a sperm whale, shark, sea-monster, or actually a small boat. The author concludes that it is a pity that "so great a prophet should be chiefly remembered for this trifling incident of his missionary journey."

THE question of how to make compulsory education laws and child labor laws jointly effective is so important that light upon it is to be welcomed from every quarter. The experience of Illinois with such legislation is that of one of the most advanced States; it is described by two experienced workers in the Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy, Drs. Edith Abbott and Sophonisba Breckinridge, in "Truancy and Non-Attendance in Chicago Schools" (University of Chicago Press; $2 net), in a manner that goes well outside the field suggested by the title. Illinois had one of the early compulsory education laws and struggled hard to enforce and to better it. The authors trace in detail the history of the fight for the legislation of 1883, for the supplementary child labor law which Jane Addams and Mrs. Florence Kelley helped bring into being in 1893, and for the final act of 1903, which stiffened the compulsory schooling provisions, effectively prohibited labor by children under fourteen, and demanded of every working child certificates of age and of schooling. They then attempt to demonstrate in what ways the existing body of legislation and the machinery for its enforcement are inadequate, and in what manner amendment seems feasible. To study this problem, they have gone deeply into the school records, the juvenile court records, the life of immigrant districts, and into what material is procurable from the children themselves. The study should be of value in Chicago and at Springfield and other State capitals.

THE NATION

A WEEKLY JOURNAL

Published and owned by the
NEW YORK EVENING POST COMPANY

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, President — ALEXANDER DANA NOYES, Vice-President
JOHN PALMER GAVIT, Sec. — WILLIAM HAZEN, Treas.
EMIL M. SCHOLZ, Publisher.

Entered at the New York City Post Office as second-class mail matter

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.—Four dollars per annum, postpaid, in United States and Mexico; to Canada, $4.50, and to foreign countries comprised in the Postal Union, $5.00.

Address, THE NATION, 20 Vesey Street, Box 794, New York, Publication Office.

LONDON OFFICE: 16 Regent Street, S. W.
WASHINGTON OFFICE: Home Life Building
CHICAGO OFFICE: 332 South Michigan Avenue
BUENOS AIRES OFFICE Lavalle 341

HAROLD DE WOLF FULLER, Editor
STANLEY WENT, Assistant Editor — PAUL ELMER MORE, Advisory Editor
WILLIAM G. PRESTON, Advertising Manager — R. B. McCLEAN, Business Manager

Notes from the Capital

Senator Vardaman

THERE is not the slightest occasion for surprise at finding in the little group of "wilful Senators" that flower of conservative statesmanship, James Kimble Vardaman, of Mississippi. His position in the recent emergency was quite consistent with his record of a lifetime. That he is a statesman you will not question after you have seen him striding majestically through a Capitol corridor, his large, smooth-shaven face, with its faintly curved nose, its full mouth, and its round chin aggressively to the front, and his long dark tresses swept straight back from his forehead and flowing down like a hairy cataract over the collar of the Spanish cloak, which is his favorite outer wrap. Whether it was nature, or only James K., that superintended his make-up for his part, it is a skilful bit of costuming, losing its best grand-opera effect only when he has shed his mantle in the Senate retiring-room; then he lapses into something more nearly approaching the commonplace, and as he sinks into his seat in the chamber he would hardly excite the curiosity of a stranger in the gallery.

This is the critic who long ago censured President Wilson for domineering over Congress, the prophet who predicted the raising of a public monument to Jefferson Davis, and the author of more than one proposal to wipe out the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution. He it was who, as Governor of Mississippi, embraced every opportunity to hurl verbal missiles of contempt at President Roosevelt, sometimes going to extremes which caused his whole State to break out in apologies. One of his newspaper flings contained a reference which was everywhere resented as an insult to the President's mother. Vardaman did not deny that he wrote the article, but insisted that he did not intend to assail a lady; that he "simply undertook, on scientific grounds, an explanation of Teddy's degeneracy and general cussedness, without holding his ancestors responsible"; and that he would "be ashamed to charge the devil himself with the responsibility of the infamy of that distinguished acci-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dent." Taft warded off similar treatment by welcoming Vardaman as a visitor soon after becoming President.

For several years Senator Tillman, of South Carolina, was looked upon as the special champion in Congress of white political supremacy. He proclaimed everywhere his keenness of feeling on the race question, and praised himself for his candor when so many other men who thought just as he did were mealy-mouthed or shuffling. After Vardaman's rise above the horizon, however, Tillman's colors began to fade. Both men were products of the same conditions; both had recognized in the rapid modernization of the South the opportunity of the "poor white" to overthrow the immemorial monopoly of official powers, titles, and emoluments by the aristocracy, and to seize some of the good things for himself. Vardaman made his campaigns for the Governorship and his first struggles for the Senate on not much else than race sentiment. It required only the State census figures and a little knowledge of human nature to convince him what issue would command the interest of the greatest number of people. The aristocrats and the poor whites were at one in their desire to keep the negro politically underneath; but the poor whites, who outnumbered the aristocrats, were opposed to the education of the negroes at public expense, because, as a rule, the negroes made more profitable use of such advantages than they. So Vardaman swept through the State, thundering at the injustice of impoverishing the white taxpayers in order to fill the negroes with a lot of learning which only unfitted them for remaining in the humble station their Creator intended them to occupy. His success was some time in maturing, because the class of whites for whose votes he was appealing did not at once realize their strength. As soon as they did, they came to his support, with results that are now history. From assailing the negroes, then, Vardaman passed to assailing the aristocrats—in other words, substituting the class issue for the race issue.

The enemies of Vardaman have been unwise in their methods of retorting. An attempt to prove that he purchased his election to the Senate with cash fell to earth pretty promptly when the returns were examined, for he was chosen, not by a free-willed Legislature, but by one which was bound by the verdict of a popular primary in which the strongest showing for him was made by those counties where the small white farmer who works with his hands in his own fields predominated; hence, if bribery was used, the money must have been wasted. Nor should it be forgotten that as Governor this same Vardaman, though voicing his sympathy with the feelings of "one whose friend or relative has been outraged or atrociously murdered by a black brute," and his unwillingness to "censure people who act a little indiscreetly under the influence of passion," declared that the courts must perform their functions to the public satisfaction, and his own intention to do all in his power to see that the laws were enforced. What is more, he was as good as his word, and waged a courageous fight against mob lawlessness and cruelty, which may have been the more effective because of his well-advertised reactionary tendencies in most matters.

However absurd he may appear when viewed from one angle, and however deserving of condemnation from another, in the last analysis we come back to the fact that the popular primary was devised for the purpose of enabling the proletariat to assert their preference without regard to the judgment of the top stratum of our society. If Vardaman does not represent the best sentiment of Mississippi, why does she keep him where he is? And if he does represent it, what right have we outsiders to complain?

TATTLER

Chapman's "Homer" and Others

EXCEPT North's "Plutarch," Chapman's "Homer" is the earliest of the translations from the classics that can still make good a claim upon the attention of the modern reader. It swam, a new world, into the ken of Keats, as doubtless to more than one since. Before Chapman's day, the "mere" English reader, as he would have been called, would have had small chance to "discerne from whence flowed his [Homer's] so generally giuen eminence and admiration." Not that Homer had been, as is sometimes stated, only the shadow of a name to the Middle Ages preceding. They had always had "Homerus Latinus"—the Latin Iliad, which after various tentatives has now been hitched to the name of Baebius Italicus. It says little to assert that this condensed paraphrase of a little over a thousand hexameter lines is not Homer. Of course not; but it follows the material of Homer step by step; it informs one as to the contents of Homer, and information was precisely what our very matter-of-fact Middle Ages were keen on. The fact that Dares and Dictys—together—tell the whole story, histographer-wise, is the controlling reason why they, and not Homer, became the basis of the mediæval Troy books. The conviction of some that Homer "made lyes . . . And was to Grekes favorable" was merely contributory.

If the Middle Ages had a fair notion of what there was in Homer, much preferring something else, the Elizabethan reader, though he had less than a Shakespearean minimum of Greek and Latin, was not cut off from some acquaintance with the Iliad, besides what he could get from the Troy books. Twelve books had been translated into French by Hugues Salel in 1545, and the work was completed, in 1574, by Amadis Jamyn. The greater part of Salel's version was turned into English by Arthur Hall, in 1581, as "Ten Books of Homers Iliads," with the addition of the Catalogue of the Ships from the Latin, the French translator having omitted it. It is written in shambling and lumpish fourteeners. The flavor of the Troy books still clings to it. "Sir Hector" and "Duke Nestor" appear before us, and the heralds cry "oies." A slight anachronism is no blemish; Juno threatening the destruction of Troy flings at Jove the tag of a proverb:

> Do what thou canst, the time wil come, that
> *Totnam French* shal turn.

Hall sometimes misunderstands his original, frequently in the case of proper names; but perhaps his chief sin is the employment of homely phrase with an incongruity which might serve as a warning—or a precedent—to some "modern" poetry. Agamemnon is addressed as "thou tipled knight"; Jove is described as "sticking with tooth and nayle stil vnto hys behest"; the Greeks could have turned back and gone home,

> Had not *Iuno* spit on her handes, and taken better holde;

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

while the Trojan fathers on the wall are called "the aged dads."

Chapman is himself sometimes guilty of this sort of thing; the Trojans charging the Grecian camp "put for it hard." But on the whole Chapman's diction deserves, as it generously received, Arnold's commendation. It is to the "tormented" style of Chapman that the famous lectures "On Translating Homer" object. And no doubt with justice; though over against the ridiculous conceit of

When sacred Troy shall shed her towers, for tears of overthrow

it is instructive to set a somewhat similar line, later revised out of all recognition, that comes finely off:

Then *Priams* high-topt towers should stoope,
ovt-facing vs no more.

But I do not ask leave at this moment to characterize Chapman's style in detail or to weigh afresh the merits of his work as a translator. I am bent on the humbler task of calling attention to some of the revisions which Chapman himself made in successive editions and to some of the faults of the modern reprints of the "Iliad" which have arisen through the neglect of editors to take sufficient account of these revisions.

There are at least four texts of the "Iliad" that must be considered: (1.) "Seaven Bookes of the Iliades of Homere," containing Books 1-2, 7-11, which appeared in 1598. (2.) Homer Prince of Poets: Translated according to the Greeke, in twelue Bookes of his Iliads," the date of which has been variously placed between 1605 and 1610. This is not at all the same text as that of 1598, although the statement in the "Dictionary of National Biography" would imply that it was. (3.) "The Iliads of Homer, Prince of Poets. Never before in any languag truely translated," 1611. This reappears in the "The Whole Works of Homer; Prince of Poetts in his Iliads, and Odysses," published in 1616, and thus forms the basis of the modern texts of Hooper (1857), Shepherd (1875), and that prepared under the editorship of I. Gollancz by W. H. D. Rouse, in Dent's "Temple Classics" (1897). This has Chapman's last hand, but in a few instances, as I mean to point out, it can be corrected with the help of the earlier editions. (4.) The "Whole Works" appears in a later form with an inferior text of the Iliad. This, sometimes called the "Second Folio," formed the basis of Taylor's edition (1843). I have not seen a copy of the original. Its readings seem to be sufficiently noticed in the editions of Hooper and Shepherd.

This account, bibliographically somewhat inadequate, must serve for the present, while we examine the character of some of the differences in (1) the Seven Books, (2) the Twelve Books, and (3) the Complete Iliad. Chapman's own account of his revision when it was all done is as follows:

> The firste and second booke, I haue wholly translated againe; the seuenth, eighth, ninth, tenth bookes, deferring still imperfect, being all Englished so long since; and my late hand (ouercome with labour) not yet rested enough to refine them (Whole Works, p. 14).

But this statement, which has been generally accepted at face value, does not tell the whole story. In comparing the Seven Books with the Twelve Books, excluding mere changes of spelling; changes of word forms, like plural for singular, *sate* for *sat, lose* for *loose, whom* for *who;* obvious corrections like *flight* for *fight* and vice-versa, I noticed, in Book I, some twenty-three lines that have undergone marked stylistic alteration, besides four passages of 6, 12, 5, and 14 lines respectively, which have been rewritten. In Book II, one passage of 16 lines has been recast and about 60 scattering lines have been changed. These two books, as Chapman says, were in the Complete Iliad wholly translated again. But it is a mistake to assume, as Chapman seems to be willing to have us assume, that Books VII-XI, inclusive, passed with little or no change through the Twelve Books into the Complete Iliad. In Book VII, disregarding minor changes as above, I estimate that the Twelve Books alter some 37 lines of the Seven Books in a manner which indicates a conscious stylistic judgment on the part of the poet. All of these changes are carried over into the Complete Iliad, which adds 6 more. The situation with respect to the later books is about as follows:

	Lines changed in the Twelve Books.	*Additional lines changed in the Complete Iliad.*
VIII	49 and one passage of 7 lines.	9
IX	35 and 9 passages of 8, 66, 4, 5, 4, 4, 4, 14, 10, 11, respectively.	5
X	24	7
XI	25	11

There are, then, considerably over three hundred changes presumably of Chapman's own devising which await examination. To this number might be added a few, but not many, more by collating with the Complete Iliad Books III, IV, V, VI, and XII of the Twelve Books. Further, the Seven Books and the Twelve Books together afford a means of controlling mistakes in the Complete Iliad, which, through failure of editors fully to exercise this control, have passed into the received text.

It must, of course, be said that many of these changes are trivial and instructive only as they remind us that authors sometimes do put themselves to the pains of tinkering their phraseology for reasons that are well nigh past finding out. Certain principles are, however, readily discernible. In several instances, Chapman is plainly trying for a simpler, a less learned word; thus *teguments* becomes *coverings* (VIII, 389), *dissipate* becomes *throw about* (X, 350); *exhale, dry up* (XI, 538); *excruciate, torment yourselves* (VIII, 393); *cruent, bloody* (VIII, 472), and *expiscate, fish out* (X, 181). Again, it is clear that at the time he was running over the text in preparation for the edition of the Twelve Books, he had conceived a strong dislike for the substituted trochee either at the beginning or in the interior of a line, and he resorts to all kinds of expedients to get rid of it. For "Sparkled beneath his bended browes" is substituted "Cast sparkles from his bended browes" (I, 103).

So *Pallas* chargde, whose heauenlie voice, prudent
Vlisses knew

was changed to read "the wise Vlisses knew" (II, 173). In at least 35 cases the changes are clearly owing to this reason. Several of the longer passages seem to have been rewritten in order to get rid of intrusive matter that had found its way into the first version without much warrant from the original. Such apparent attempts at greater fidelity appear in IX, 13 ff., 47 ff., 118 ff. Once he deletes four lines which represent nothing in the Greek (VIII, 261 ff.). But greater literalism is not always his aim; in IX, 137, he softens a rather frankly spoken phrase of Agamemnon, and in II, 249, κῆρες θανάτοιο, first translated

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

death armde fates, becomes for no apparent reason *gratious fates.*

We must now note some of the instances in which it is possible to correct the received text, based on the Complete Iliad, by means of the earlier editions.

At II, 477, all the modern editions follow the Complete Iliad in reading *Eristhius,* but this is clearly a misprint for *Ericthius*—a good enough Elizabethan form for *Erectheus*—which is the reading of both the earlier texts. To the reading of the Complete Iliad "at the fleet of *Ithacus* he paste" is unquestionably to be preferred that of the other texts "as the Fleete," etc. Both Hooper and Shepherd adopt this reading, but whether as a happy emendation or with authority they do not make plain. Hooper has some acquaintance with the earlier editions, but makes insufficient use of them. In the modern editions, following the Complete Iliad, Ὦρτο πολὺ πρῶτος μὲν ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων (H, 162) appears as "Atrides *for* the first" (VII, 143); but this has nothing to recommend it as against the reading of both earlier editions, "Atrides *far* the first," which accurately translates πολύ, leaving, I think, no room for doubt that *for* is a misprint and not an author's change. Such another passage occurs at VIII, 372, in the words of Iris to Athene:

> But thou most greeu'st him (dogged dame) whom
> he rebukes in tyme,
> Least *licence* should peruert thy will, and pride
> too highly clyme.

This is the reading of the earlier editions and is undoubtedly to be preferred to *silence,* the reading of the Complete Iliad, and of all the reprints.

I prefer to stop here rather than to introduce at this time questions which are not clear at a glance, the discussion of which is more properly in place in a new edition of the text than in an essay which aims merely to open the question.

HARRY MORGAN AYRES

Finance

The Markets After the Vote for War

IN the American markets, the week in which the United States declared war on Germany witnessed three interesting movements. On the Stock Exchange, prices (especially for shares of industrial companies) declined sharply, but prices for bonds held firm. On the commercial markets, an exceedingly violent advance occurred in wheat.

The decline in stocks was an evident result of reports from Washington of unexpectedly heavy war taxation, which suggested not only an increased income tax, but conceivably the drastic taxing of profits from manufacturing war material, or of business profits generally. The decline in prices was not at any time of a character to reflect consternation, but it plainly reflected bewilderment over the influence of such possible exactions on yield and therefore intrinsic value of securities.

An extensive programme of war taxation would be reflected first in the stock market, where prices are necessarily influenced by surplus profits. A programme of war loans should affect primarily the bond market. When war with Spain was visibly impending, in the early months of 1898, United States 4 per cents of 1925 declined from 129¾ in January (the highest price since their issue in 1895) to 117¾ in April, just before declaration of war. Five months before the Civil War began in April, 1861, the 5 per cents of 1874 had sold at 103; they touched 75 when Fort Sumter fell.

On both occasions, they recovered later; but the precedent makes the action of the present Government bond market very striking. United States coupon 4 per cents, at their highest price of 1916, sold for 112¼. Four days after the dismissal of Bernstorff, they stood at 111⅛. On March 13, with the arming of merchant ships just announced at Washington, they sold on the Stock Exchange at 109, and they sold at that price this present week.

The case of the general bond market was quite as interesting. With all the talk of enormous borrowings by the United States Government, declines were almost wholly limited to unimportant fractions, and advances were not lacking. Nor, in fact, was this the only test of bond market conditions. On the day of President Wilson's speech it was announced that all of the new $60,000,000 4½ per cent. bonds of the Pennsylvania Railroad, offered at 97½ three days before, had been taken by investors. On Thursday, after the Senate's vote for war, $25,000,000 four per cent. bonds of New York State were taken by a banking syndicate at 104.817; the most favorable price obtained by the State in seven years.

The rise in wheat—on one day it went up 12 cents a bushel—was due to other causes. The Government's estimate on the condition of the winter wheat crop—the first of the season and awaited with great interest, in view of the world-wide situation as to food supplies—was published on Saturday. It unfortunately bore out the most unfavorable conjectures of the grain trade. Even a condition 70 per cent. of normal, which the trade had rather generally predicted, would have been the lowest April figure in a generation. But the Department of Agriculture puts the percentage at 63⅜. For that result, it would not be easy to find a parallel in the Department's records; the only figure as low as this was the 62 per cent. of June, 1885, and that came at the end, not the beginning, of the growing season.

On the basis of present conditions, the Government estimates an indicated winter wheat yield of 430,000,000 bushels. This compares with 495,000,000 named as last year's April indication, and with 481,700,000 bushels actually turned out at harvest. The one offsetting consideration to this winter wheat situation is the possibility of large planting and a successful outcome to the spring wheat crop. In 1912, on a smaller planted acreage than this season's, the final yield of winter wheat was only 400,000,000 bushels. But the spring wheat States produced the largest crop on record, and the country's total wheat yield was the largest in half a dozen years and the third largest recorded in our history.

That the stock market should decline on the announcement of the Government's far-reaching programme of military purposes and war finance was not unnatural. Convinced though Wall Street itself had been during a good many months before April 2 that war with Germany was unavoidable, there was nevertheless a somewhat widespread expectation that our own active participation in the conflict would be relatively small. The developments at Washington came, therefore, in the nature of a disillusion-

(Continued on page 443.)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Summary of the News

WAR with Germany was formally declared on the afternoon of Good Friday, when President Wilson signed the joint resolution of Congress declaring that a state of war had been "thrust upon the United States." On the same day the President issued a proclamation announcing the existence of a state of war and detailing regulations which should govern the conduct of enemy aliens. German ships in American harbors had already been taken over by the Federal authorities on the morning of April 6, their crews being interned.

IN the Senate the war resolution was adopted on April 4 by a vote of 82 to 6, after a debate that had lasted thirteen hours. The debate throughout was on a high level, the length of it being mainly attributable to Senator La Follette, who delivered a four-hour speech opposing war and assailing Great Britain. The debate in the House was longer, lasting sixteen and a half hours, the vote for war (373 to 50) being finally taken at 3:15 on Friday morning, April 6. The minority vote was slightly larger than had been prophesied, some doubtful Representatives, it is surmised, being persuaded to an anti-war position by the personal prestige of Mr. Kitchin, who spoke and voted against the resolution.

COMMENT on President Wilson's address to Congress, official and otherwise, from neutral and Allied countries, has been unstinted in praise. In England, France, Russia, and Italy the news of America's entry into the war was received with the utmost enthusiasm. The sentiment of France was expressed in a message sent by President Poincaré to President Wilson on April 5, to which Mr. Wilson returned a graceful reply on Sunday. England, not less enthusiastic, was slower to take official action, the greetings of the British Parliament being postponed until after the Easter recess in view of the fact that the decision of Congress could not be declared before the adjournment of Parliament—a formal standing on the order of its going which has met with considerable criticism in the British press. The feeling of England has found voice, however, in a message from King George to President Wilson, suitably acknowledged on Monday, and in statements to the Associated Press by Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Asquith, and others. Prof. Paul Milyukov spoke for Russia in an eloquent statement to the press contained in dispatches of April 7.

SOUTH AMERICA appears likely to rally to the support of the United States. President Wilson's address evoked immediate commendation from the press notably of Chili, Peru, and Brazil. In all three of these countries there is apparently a strong sentiment in favor of a declaration of war on Germany. From Brazil, indeed, a declaration appears likely within the next few days, the flame of anti-German indignation having been fanned by the torpedoing of the Brazilian steamship Parana. The attitude of Argentina is regarded as more doubtful on account of the powerful German influence there, but the important newspaper *La Prensa* is for coöperation with the United States. Particularly gratifying to this country are the promptness and enthusiasm with which Cuba and Panama have allied themselves with us. The former's declaration of a state of war with Germany was approved unanimously by both House and Senate on April 7, and on the same day the President of Panama signed a proclamation committing the republic unreservedly to the assistance of the United States in defence of the Canal. In Central America Guatemala, whose geographic position and efficient army make her a Power to be reckoned with, shows a disposition to coöperate with the United States.

GERMAN comment on the additional enemy is just about what was expected—violent denunciation of President Wilson's "hypocrisy" and a characteristic outburst of the *furor Teutonicus* against all things American. A new and revised edition of the "Hymn of Hate" may be expected shortly. It is interesting to note, however, the tinge of genuine regret that runs through the comment of a Liberal paper like the Berlin *Tageblatt*, and its recognition of the adverse effect that America's action is likely to have on German designs of bringing about a separate peace with liberalized Russia. To such designs M. Kerensky, Russian Minister of Justice, administered a cold douche when he declared to press representatives on April 7 that "the possibility of entering on preliminary negotiations" might be facilitated if the German people were to dethrone the Kaiser. Still more interesting is the connection between America's entry into the war and the increasing demand for democratic reform in Germany to counteract, as *Vorwärts* says, the "tempest of the world's public opinion."

OFFICIAL efforts in Germany in the direction recommended by *Vorwärts* are presumably epitomized in the Kaiser's order to the Imperial Chancellor, published in Sunday's papers, the gist of which is that the Prussian autocrat is "resolved to begin building up our internal political, economic, and social life as soon as the war situation permits." That seems to mean that, under pressure of all Liberal sections, Junkerdom has made up its mind to yield, after the war is over, such extension of the franchise as is absolutely necessary. The Kaiser's intervention in what the *Lokal Anzeiger* terms "an unpleasant internal dispute" seems to have been hailed by most of the German press with the customary sycophancy ("A people's kingdom of the Hohenzollerns" is one expression), but the Liberal *Tageblatt* is unenthusiastic—"we wished for an immediate start in fulfilling the Chancellor's promise, but the value of the Emperor's proposal is not small"—while *Vorwärts* roundly declares that Socialists "will take into account only deeds."

PREPARATIONS for war have been pushed forward steadily. Details of the new Army bill, on which we comment in our editorial columns, were published in the New York *Times* of April 6. The bill provides for the raising of the regular army to full war strength, for the drafting of the militia, raised to war strength, into the Federal service, and for the enlistment of 1,000,000 men by selective drafting. To the last feature of the bill considerable opposition is likely to be encountered in the House. For the equipment and maintenance of this new army and for increased expenditure on the navy, appropriations totalling $3,401,000,000 were submitted last week by Secretary McAdoo. In addition Congress was to be asked to-day (Thursday) to authorize a popular loan for immediate war purposes of $5,000,000,000, of which it was proposed to set aside $3,000,000,000 for the purchase of war bonds of the Allied Governments. A proposed appointment that will cause universal congratulation is that of Herbert C. Hoover to the chairmanship of a committee on food supplies and prices during the war.

AUSTRIA, after a period of indecision, in which a new crop of peace rumors arose, only to receive official denial from Berlin, severed diplomatic relations with the United States on Sunday. Ambassador Penfield had left Vienna on his way home the preceding day. Baron Erich Zwiedinek, Chargé d'Affaires of the Austro-Hungarian Embassy in Washington, asked for his passports on Monday, and at the same time the news of the break in Vienna, already unofficially reported, was received from the American Minister at Berne. Sweden will take charge of the interests of Austria here, and the United States will be represented in Vienna by the Spanish Embassy.

SUBMARINES or mines, according to the British official statement for the week ending April 1, sank during that period eighteen British merchant vessels of more than 1,600 tons, and thirteen of less than that amount. Seventeen were unsuccessfully attacked. Arrivals at British ports of vessels of all nationalities of more than 100 tons during the week were 2,281; sailings were 2,399. Two American ships, the Missourian and the Seward, were torpedoed last week, all hands being saved. Three Belgian relief ships were sunk, two of them at least by submarines.

NEWS from Russia indicates that the new Government has not escaped the clashes of opinion almost the inevitable concomitant of such a peripetia. Dispatches from Petrograd of April 8 told of friction between the Government and the Council of the Workmen's and Soldiers' Deputies, the latter announcing its right to ignore governmental authority when in its opinion such authority overrides popular freedom. In consequence some amount of disorganization persists in the factories, and the newspapers are filled with appeals to the workmen to subordinate themselves to the needs of the army. On the other hand, the dispatches state that there is growing support of the Government by the military. The repeal of all laws limiting the rights of Russian citizens in regard to creeds and religions is announced.

MILITARY operations in the West on an important scale were extended on Monday to the ten-mile front between a point south of Lens and one south of Arras. From reports available as we write, the operation appears to be one of first-class importance, probably the beginning of the general spring offensive, directed presumably towards Lille as the ultimate objective. The German positions were penetrated all along the line, and about 10,000 prisoners were taken the first day. Progress has also been made along the road from Bapaume to Cambrai, the occupation of Hermies and Boursies, eight miles from Cambrai, being reported on Monday. The fall of St. Quentin appears imminent, the capture of Fresnoy-le-Petit bringing the British to within two and a half miles of the outskirts of that place. The new offensive was foreshadowed at the end of last week by unprecedented aerial activity, as a result of which British supremacy in the air appears to have been definitely reëstablished.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(Continued from page 441.)

ment. The burdens on the country's resources in the way of both national loans and national taxes will be heavy; incorporated industry must share them with individuals; but what occurred on the Stock Exchange, when the large figures of the proposed loans and taxes were announced, reflected simply the first confusion of ideas as to which was the predominant influence of the moment on the attitude of investors.

There will be abundant time for the financial community to appraise both influences. The first and most powerful offset to the uncertainty of sentiment shown this week will come on consideration of the extent to which the plans for military preparedness on the large scale will guarantee the national security in a war with so resourceful, desperate, and unscrupulous an antagonist.

Nowhere has the assumption of our half-hearted and restricted participation in the war produced more effect than in official Germany, which has used that assumption to convince its people that America would be negligible in the European conflict. Nowhere has the absence of such preparedness been more frequently insisted on, as a dangerous condition in a country on the verge of war, than in our own financial circles. With the declaration of war come prompt and comprehensive measures to correct that part of the situation.

It is impossible that this consideration should not be reflected in financial sentiment. How far it will offset other legitimate considerations, it remains for the market to show. But no one need wait for the movement of the coming weeks or months on the Stock Exchange to learn the real financial view, regarding, on the one hand, the capacity of our immensely prosperous and well-organized finance to meet all necessary requisitions on it, and, on the other, the manner in which our international power and prestige have been fortified by the fact that the United States is at length bringing Germany to the final reckoning.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK

FICTION

Barcynska, Countess. If Wishes Were Horses. Dutton. $1.50 net.
Bartlett, F. O. The Triflers. Houghton Mifflin. $1.40 net.
Beresford, J. D. The Wonder. Doran. $1.40 net.
Cutler, R. Louisburg Square. Macmillan. $1.50 net.
Ervine, St. J. G. Changing Winds. Macmillan. $1.60 net.
Hall, H. What He Least Expected. Bobbs-Merrill. $1.50 net.
Hine, M. Autumn. Lane. $1.40 net.
Humphrey, Z. Grail Fire. Dutton. $1.50 net.
Lincoln, M. A Modern Becky Sharp. Badger. $1.25 net.
Norris, K. Undertow. Doubleday, Page. $1.25.
Ogden, G. W. The Rustler of Wind River. McClurg. $1.30.
Paterson, I. The Magpie's Nest. Lane. $1.40 net.
Scandlin, H. W. The Wicked John Goode. Doran. $1 net.
Tarbé, E. Angele. Translated by H. W. Bartol. Lippincott. $1.25 net.
Tree, H. B. Nothing Matters. Houghton Mifflin. $1.60 net.
Tuttle, F. G. Give My Love to Maria. Abingdon Press. $1 net.

MISCELLANEOUS

Alington, C. A. Shrewsbury Fables. Longmans, Green. 75 cts.
Bullitt, E. D. An Uncensored Diary. Doubleday, Page. $1.25 net.
Carroll, H. K. Federal Council Year Book. Covering the year 1916.
Conwell, R. H. What You Can Do with Your Will Power. Harper. 50 cents.
Davis, W. H. English Essayists. Badger. $1.50 net.
DuBois, J. T., and Mathews, G. S. Galusha A. Grow—Father of the Homestead Law. Houghton Mifflin. $1.75 net.
Elbiquet. Supplementary Magic. Dutton. $1.25 net.
Elliott, G. R. Our Progress-Idea and the War. Badger. 75 cents net.
Frothingham, P. R. A Confusion of Tongues. Houghton Mifflin. $1.25 net.
Goodnow, F. J. The Colver Lectures, 1916. Providence: Brown University.
Hancock, J. L. Studies in Stichomythia. University of Chicago Press.
Hindu Mind Training. By an Anglo-Saxon Mother. Introduction by S. M. Mitra. Longmans, Green. $3.50 net.

ON VITAL RESERVES

The Energies of Men
The Gospel of Relaxation

By WILLIAM JAMES

These two famous essays in one volume, uniform with the popular editions of the author's "On Some of Life's Ideals" and "Habit." *Each 50 cents net.*

Henry Holt & Co. 19W.44thSt. New York

An Introduction to
SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY
BY
CHARLES A. ELLWOOD
Professor of Sociology in the University of Missouri

A comprehensive and systematic study of the social life on its psychological side, bridging the gap between psychology and the social sciences.

At all booksellers. 8vo. $2.00 net.

THIS IS AN APPLETON BOOK

Life and Times of David Humphreys
"Belov'd of Washington"
Soldier—Statesman—Poet
1752-1818

By Frank Landon Humphreys

8°. 2 vols. 39 illus. $7.50 net.

The life of David Humphreys was so intimately connected with that of the father of the Republic that it is well-nigh impossible to write of one without writing of the other. The singular neglect of historians to give Humphreys his proper place in the annals of American history is at last remedied by the publication of this sympathetic biography that sheds a new light not only upon the personality of Humphreys, but upon his relations to his time.

To the stern patriotism of this great leader we owe the suppression of the Barbary Pirates, to whom even England and France had been paying tribute.

At All Booksellers

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS
New York London

Amusements

HIPPODROME
MATINEE TODAY
BEST SEATS $1.00
100 Novelties
New Ice Ballet
THE BIG SHOW
1000 PEOPLE
WITH ANNETTE (Hersey) KELLERMANN AND 200 MERMAIDS
IN THE WATER SENSATION
NEW CIRCUS FEATURES
BIGGEST SHOW — LOWEST PRICES

EMPIRE B'way, 40 St. Evenings 8:30. Matinees Wed. & Sat., 2:30.
MAUDE ADAMS A KISS FOR CINDERELLA

WHY MEN FIGHT
By Bertrand Russell

Herein the famous English philosopher searches out the deep-lying causes of war in human nature, and sets forth with passionate simplicity a remedial mode of thinking and living. *Price, $1.50.*

Published by THE CENTURY CO., New York

Send for free pamphlet telling how the new method in treating Diabetes has been adapted to home use by Dr. J. H. Kellogg. Send a postal to-day to —Good Health. 7804 Main St., Battle Creek, Mich.

Diabetes

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Pan-Angles

A Consideration of the Federation of the Seven English-Speaking Nations

By SINCLAIR KENNEDY

The Pan-Angles is the term used to designate the self-governing white people of New Zealand, Australia, South Africa, Newfoundland, Canada, the British Isles, and the United States. This book sets forth characteristics that make the Pan-Angles one people: one in history, language, law and form of government —one in civilizations. It shows how the Pan-Angle civilization is threatened by rival civilizations—the German, Japanese, Russian, and Chinese—and maintains that in order to survive, the Pan-Angle nations must come together into a common government.

The idea is not new. Benjamin Franklin in his time, and Cecil Rhodes in his, realized the need of a common government for all the English-speaking people.

8vo. $1.75 net

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., Publishers
Fourth Avenue and Thirtieth Street, New York

The New York Evening Post

Spring Book Review

Saturday, April 14

Among the special features of this number will be an article by Elizabeth Miner King on the revolution which is being caused in the production of "best sellers" by the moving-picture craze. Other special articles will include:

Nathan Hale and the Great Fire in New York, a Reply to the Author of The Jumel Mansion, by Professor H. P. Johnston of the College of the City of New York.

A Japanese Poet's Experience in Literary England, by Yone Noguchi.

A guide to the books of the season will be offered in the form of a list of three hundred of the new titles, arranged by classes and accompanied with brief explanations of the nature of the volumes.

There will be an unusual array of reviews of books in all departments of literature, in addition to the customary features of the Reader's Guide and the column on bookplates.

Mailed to any address for 5c. The Book Section of the New York Evening Post is part of the regular Saturday issue every week—$2.50 a year.

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC., REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF CONGRESS OF AUGUST 24, 1912, OF

The Nation

Published weekly, Thursdays, at New York, N. Y., for April 1, 1917.

State of New York, } ss:
County of New York, }

Before me, a Notary Public, in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared Robt. B. McClean, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is the Business Manager of The Nation, and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management (and if a daily paper, the circulation), etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, embodied in section 443, Postal Laws and Regulations, printed on the reverse of this form, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are:

Publisher—Emil M. Scholz,
20 Vesey St., New York City.

Editor—Harold de Wolf Fuller,
1 East 9th Street, New York City.

Managing Editor—Harold de Wolf Fuller,
1 East 9th Street, New York City.

Business Manager—Robt. B. McClean,
655 East 14th St., Brooklyn, N. Y.

2. That the owners are: (Give names and addresses of individual owners, or if a corporation, give its name and the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding 1 per cent. or more of the total amount of stock.)

New York Evening Post Co., 20 Vesey St., New York City. Stockholders:

Henry Adams, 1605 H Street, N. W., Washington, D. C.; Mrs. John M. Howells, 130 West 57th Street, New York; Alexander D. Noyes, 260 West 76th Street, New York; Emil M. Scholz, 20 Vesey Street, New York; Harold M. Phelps Stokes, 209 Madison Avenue, New York; Oswald G. Villard, Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.; Oswald G. Villard, Trustee for Fanny G. Villard, Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.; Fanny G. Villard, Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.; Miss Martha R. White, 18 West 69th Street, New York; Miss Amelia E. White, 18 West 69th Street, New York.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 per cent. or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: (If there are none so state.)

Alexander D. Noyes, 260 West 76th Street, New York; Emil M. Scholz, 20 Vesey Street, New York; Harold M. Phelps Stokes, 209 Madison Avenue, New York; Oswald G. Villard, Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.; Fanny G. Villard, Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.

4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company, but also, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association, or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stock, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by him.

5. That the average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed, through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the six months preceding the date shown above is ——. (This information is required from daily publications only.)

ROBT. B. McCLEAN, Business Manager.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 31st day of March, 1917. Henry H. Brown,
Notary Public, New York County.

(My commission expires March 31, 1917.)
Form 3526.—Ed. 1916.

NOTE.—This statement must be made in duplicate and both copies delivered by the publisher to the postmaster, who shall send one copy to the Third Assistant Postmaster-General (Division of Classification), Washington, D. C., and retain the other in the files of the post office. The publisher must publish a copy of this statement in the second issue printed next after its filing.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Nation Supplement

Two Sections | NEW YORK, THURSDAY, APRIL 12, 1917 | Section II

A SYMPOSIUM OF LIBERAL OPINION

Comment on the International Situation by European Observers

BY courtesy of the New York *Evening Post* the *Nation* is enabled to reprint herewith a remarkable symposium of prominent European publicists and statesmen of liberal convictions on the international situation as it appeared to them immediately after the breaking of diplomatic relations between this country and Germany. The various messages were received by cable in response to the request of the *Evening Post* and are here reprinted, with their date-lines, in the order of their original publication. Those who contributed to the symposium were: Theodor Wolff, Editor of the Berlin *Tageblatt,* perhaps the best known Liberal editor in Germany; H. W. Massingham, Editor of the London *Nation;* Robert de Caix, principal writer on foreign affairs for the *Journal des Débats,* of Paris; Paul Milyukov, leader of the Constitutional Democrats in Russia and now Foreign Minister in the new Government; Pierre Renaudel, the radical-socialist editor of the Parisian *L'Humanité,* and C. P. Scott, Editor of the great Liberal paper of the English provinces, the *Manchester Guardian.*

The Break in Relations

By THEODOR WOLFF
Editor of the Berlin "Tageblatt"

THOSE of us who have always worked for friendship between Germany and the United States and have fought against the pan-Germanic movement and annexation of foreign territory see in Wilson's decision not only an act of partisanship against Germany, but also a monstrous mistake. The note of the Entente, which demanded the gagging and dismemberment of Germany as well as the complete dissolution of Austria-Hungary, was bound to strengthen tremendously the war spirit in all camps. In the Entente countries it corresponded to the desires of the Nationalists who preach merciless war. In Germany the note gave to the pan-Germanists and annexationists the strongest possible position, for they can now point to the monstrous desires of the Entente as their justification.

We others who do not wish any subjection of foreign peoples, and particularly no direct or indirect destruction of Belgian independence, are made by it to appear as altogether too unselfish weaklings. Those of us who, like myself, desire to bring about the most worth-while ending of the war in a sensible and practical peace in which each one of the belligerents makes and receives concessions, are now answered, that after the statement of the Entente only war to annihilation is possible.

In this situation some of us hoped that Wilson would energetically oppose the war desires of the Entente Powers which went absolutely counter to his peaceful tendencies and made impossible the restoration of a peaceful Europe. Had he done this, he would have tremendously strengthened the pacifist and anti-Nationalist currents in this country. Unfortunately, Wilson only drew a picture of a future league of nations, which indeed has our approval, but is of no practical worth at the present moment and never can be brought to pass if the war leaves behind it dismembered, embittered peoples struggling for freedom.

With no single clear word did Wilson dissent from the purposes of England, France, and Russia. The Central Powers, thus threatened with a war for their annihilation, have determined to use the extremest means for defence, and Germany has begun an unlimited U-boat war. Even those who have hitherto opposed this method have placed themselves behind their Government and the supreme command of the army, in view of the patent facts and because of the threats of the Entente.

Opinions differ here about many of the questions relating to peace and war, but the whole German people is united in the determination not to let itself be destroyed. No one who knows this people will believe that its power is weakened. Never would it for conquest's sake endlessly pour out its blood. Its existence, its freedom to move about in the world, and the heritage of its children it will defend to the last drop of its blood, and with all possible means.

To the enlightened and democratic elements among us it would be sorrowful indeed if Germany should in doing so have come into open conflict with the great democracy of America. We still wish to hope that this can be avoided. But whoever judges of the situation soberly knows that only under one condition can this conflict be avoided—only if Wilson orders American ships to avoid the blockaded region (*Sperrgebiet*). Just as Wilson's new policy is going to hinder the creation of a league of peoples and a lasting peace, it will also be detrimental to a liberal and progressive development of Germany.

If Germany wins, as we believe it will, in battle against all the Western and the democratic peoples, the result is self-evident. If Germany succumbs to superior forces, which we do not believe, and she should be subjugated and pinioned as the Entente desires, this powerful and Fatherland-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

loving people will not quietly submit to its fate. There will follow a Nationalistic movement which will put into the background in Germany all thoughts of domestic freedom. In any event, Mr. Wilson is now retarding or making impossible the realization of all the ideas to which he is apparently devoted.

Berlin, February 13, via Sayville, February 16

The Allies' Terms of Peace

BY H. W. MASSINGHAM

Editor of the London "Nation"

I HAVE always strongly opposed any interpretation of the Entente's note as meaning the annihilation or dismemberment of the Central Powers. I believe that the Liberal party in England is opposed to any such issue. This view is upheld by all its principal organs in the press with more or less emphasis and is hardly even avowed by the extreme section of our Imperialist press.

Both the late and the present Premiers of England and the late and present Foreign Secretaries have disclaimed German dismemberment as the end of war, Mr. Lloyd George declaring that it was not our purpose to hinder German national development, while Mr. Asquith has stated that there is no substantial difference between his ideal of peace organization and Mr. Wilson's.

It is the real identity of feeling between American and British Liberalism which governs our view of possible American intervention in the war. We desire an international settlement of its issues and believe that America alone can secure this and thus avert an interminable and utterly desolating war, involving world famine and financial ruin as well as permanent estrangement between rival European groups. National opinion here is firm in regard to the prosecution of the war, but increasingly moderate as to terms of peace, provided Germany abandons her conquests and schemes of aggression, restores territory and repairs damages, acknowledges full Belgian and Servian sovereignty, and takes her place in European councils. This was essentially Viscount Grey's view of the character of the settlement. If we secure it, our aims are essentially satisfied and Germany's essentially defeated.

Our Allied note must have generally aimed at establishment of autonomous rather than independent governments, for this is the solution of Irish difficulties which Liberalism would apply, and we could not demand more of Austria than we yield ourselves.

Nor can the party of free trade and free intercourse among nations identify itself with the policy of crippling German trade after the war or denying her access to raw materials which the Empire controls. These ideas are inconsistent with our interests no less than with our declared aims in entering war and cannot be sustained.

London, February 21

Militarism Versus Liberty

By ROBERT DE CAIX

Of the "Journal des Débats"

HAS a burglar an honest right to protest when his victim endeavors to bind his arms and throw him out? America is faced by this question on account of the German propaganda, which would reconcile the United States to submarine war by alleging the necessities of a Germany threatened with annihilation. In actual fact, what we wish to do is to repel attack and to prevent its recurrence; but the war aims published by the Entente, while Germany meanwhile refuses to disclose hers, tend to annihilate no people whatever. The nations of the Entente, which in 1914 only asked to be left alone, to-day desire that the war should settle certain questions which were then quiescent but which the war itself has reopened. They propose to restore Alsace-Lorraine to France, Prussian Poland to a reunited and autonomous Poland, on the lines drawn by President Wilson in his message to Congress. Probably also they would allow the Danish inhabitants of Schleswig to dispose of themselves in accordance with the Treaty of Prague, which Bismarck always refused to carry out.

Would it be to dismember and destroy Germany to withdraw 1,800,000 Alsatians, 4,000,000 Poles, and 150,000 Danes from the Empire which has fastened them to 62,000,000 of true Germans? These peoples are not German and do not wish to be. For example, those of Alsace-Lorraine have preserved, since the great Revolution which they made with France, a democratic spirit that makes them still foreigners after forty-four years of submission to the imperial yoke of Germany. Nevertheless, the Prussian machine strives to destroy the liberty of these men, whom it deals with as if they were raw material out of which to make Germans.

To put an end to this wicked anachronism would not be to annihilate Germany. If the rulers of the German Empire simply make their people believe that they are fighting to the end for that Imperialism which is their reason for existing, neutrals ought not to be deceived by this mixing-up of Prussian militarism with the very existence of the German nation. Austria-Hungary, which oppresses thirty millions of men instead of six, is admittedly threatened with greater losses than Germany; but the Entente does not desire to withdraw from Austria all oppressed peoples or to annihilate her. If the Dual Monarchy should cease to be the dominion of two ruling races, Germans and Magyars, and should become a Federal state or a grouping of free nationalities, as is Switzerland, she would be in no danger, but would be a bulwark of peace; and the Entente's aims in the war as concerns her would in general be achieved.

These aims are, in fact, merely dictated by the very spirit of the policy of the enemy empires. France solely wishes to make sure of her own liberty while restoring that of others. Her conception of European peace is much nearer the American ideal than is the Prussian scheme for the organization of Europe. Accordingly, we are pleased that the force of events makes European affairs more and more your own. By taking part in them you will understand them more exactly, despite all deceptive interpretations, and will see, as we do, in Prussian militarism a case of political disease and of danger for the liberties of all. If you are led on to take part in the war, you will play a rôle still more decisive in the establishment of a peace which you could accept, and afterwards assume your portion of the responsibility of maintaining it. That is the principal advantage which we should see in American intervention. An added policeman, so strong in himself and by his position, would be welcome in a time when no means have yet been found to dispense with the strong arm to enforce law.

Paris, February 26

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The United States Welcomed in the War

By C. P. SCOTT

Editor of the "Manchester Guardian"

THERE is no question among Englishmen of the annihilation of the Central Powers or their complete dismemberment, as stated by Herr Wolff, and the Allies' note to President Wilson is not understood here in that sense or anything like it. Undoubtedly the note on its face implies the break-up of the composite Austro-Hungarian state, but the word "liberation" may be understood as implying the autonomy rather than the independence of the subject populations, and that solution is regarded here as not necessarily excluded. If the harsher interpretation is adopted, it would imply the ultimate absorption of all the Austrian Germans in one German state, a vast addition to German power.

An independent Poland again demands no greater surrender from the Central Powers than from Russia. The restoration of Alsace-Lorraine cannot be regarded as a dismemberment of Germany. It is extravagant, therefore, to say that complete dismemberment is the Allies' objective. Necessarily, also, the formal demand was put at the highest.

Liberal Englishmen, excluding extreme pacifists, who desire no extension of the war area, would welcome the United States entering the war alike for its immediate moral and military value and for its influence on the future course of events. They hold that the principles for which we are fighting, the supremacy of the law and liberties of peoples, are at the root of your civilization as of ours, and that this war will settle for generations whether they or those of a militarist autocratic state which would trample on them are to prevail the world over. We think that we are fighting your war as well as our own. If we go down, beyond question you will be attacked next. Liberty and autocracy, once they are pitted against each other, can no more share the civilized world than could freedom and slavery the United States. One will drive out the other. The only question is, which shall it be?

The fact that the breach between the United States and the Central Powers should take place on a question of international law and right is not accidental. It arises out of the fundamental antagonism of principle. It is not the ethical aspect of the submarine outrages which is really most important, but the easy overruling of law and right when these come into conflict with an immediate supposed national interest, which has been the startling characteristic of German policy and action from the first day of the war. If, as war goes on, more material aims come in, as they are bound to do, you, as most disinterested of great belligerent Powers, might help to moderate and rationalize them. As to the value of your assistance, it is beyond question, if rightly directed and coördinated with our military needs and activities. How can the aid of scores of millions of the most energetic, ingenious, and resolute people in the world be negligible? It must in the end be decisive.

Manchester, March 2

To Render War Impossible

By PIERRE RENAUDEL

Editor of "L'Humanité"

THE intensified submarine warfare naturally rouses the whole world to consider many questions. You have asked me to reply to some of them. I do so willingly. First of all, it is necessary to take up a preliminary question. Germany plumes herself on having offered negotiations to bring about the end of the war, but why did not Germany, like the Allies, state her conditions of peace? She merely offered to bring together diplomats at a table behind closed doors. President Wilson proposed diplomacy in public. The Allies replied to him, Germany did not. The Allies issued a note in a spirit contrary to what Herr Wolff alleges. He denies to the Allies the right to desire either a dismemberment of the German people or a political dismemberment of the Empire.

Undoubtedly it will be impossible to prevent such territorial questions from being raised at the end of the war. Some of them are entirely legitimate from the point of view of strict legality, but in behalf of many men in public life, and in the name of the great majority of the soldiers of the Allied countries, I am able to say that these are not, and ought not to be, the chief aims of the war. What they desire is to render war impossible, and to prevent a recurrence of a calamity like that of 1914. This is what preoccupies them. This is what constitutes the moral spring of the soldiers of the Entente. And what other security could be attained in this order of ideas but a constitution in which the rights of nations should be based upon a society of nations?

Now if these principles are once accepted, established, and fixed, how would they be related to the peace itself and its consequences? How could the Allies say, as they have done in their note, that they adhere to the plan of the league of nations if first of all they wish to go on to the annihilation of certain peoples, even with the excuse of punishing those who began the war, and who could have prevented it if they had agreed to the methods of arbitration which were proposed to them? Thus it is but one more error for Germany to refer to the attitude of the Allies, as expressed in their note, in order to justify her submarine warfare. It is an error which arises from the fact that German statesmen do not depend enough upon the moral forces of law, and count too much upon resort to brutal force. One cannot but be astonished to learn of their persistence in this error, even after the noble efforts of President Wilson to bring out of the chaos of war the germs of law and of peace.

The total result has been to place the United States, in the language used by Secretary Lansing, on the verge of war with the Central Empires. If one must rejoice at such a development of events, a Frenchman like myself would not express it out of feeling of discretion which I have always tried to observe, and which you will understand. But I may say that if the United States enters the war on the side of the Allies, it will be there, as it will appear to many democrats and to the Socialists of France, as a reinforcement for their own deepest feelings. We struggle for the liberty and the rights of the entire world. To us it would seem still more evident that sufficient wisdom and moderation and clear foresight would be assured, so that above the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ruins and the mournings of war might arise that Peace which all, provided certain lawful aspirations are secured, devoutly desire. It would be a Peace which, according to the phrase of the President of the French Council, would permit all nations to develop in accordance with their own genius, on condition of each one respecting the rights of the others in that very development.

Paris, March 3

A Decisive Victory

By PAUL MILYUKOV

Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs

WE heartily endorse President Wilson's pacifist schemes for the world's future organization. But the only way is a decisive victory, as peace without victory will encourage Germany's strivings for the world's supremacy, and will enable her to prepare militarily the territories of her present allies for new aggression, thus inflicting upon humanity a further chaos of armaments.

The only means of preventing this result, we consider, are a thorough rebuilding of southeastern Europe on the basis of the freedom of small nations and lasting ethnographic frontiers. The last cause for perpetual trouble in Europe will thus be eliminated, and permanent peace will be secured. This explains why Turkey's final destruction and Austria-Hungary's disruption by liberating the nationalities are here generally considered essential for attaining President Wilson's noble scope by putting an end to Germany's *Weltpolitik*.

On the other hand, nobody wishes to crush Germany, or to destroy German unity. On the contrary, a complete national union may be attained by Germany's securing the Austro-Germans.

Nor do we wish to interfere with German commerce, except certain aggressive tendencies aiming at monopolizing the world's production or industry.

We think that our soldiers who fight and die in the trenches strive for the promotion of sound principles of international law, based on the good-will of nations, against its numberless violations by arrogant worshippers of mere force. We know that a growing majority of Americans are sympathetic with the cause of the Allies, and we followed with keen admiration the heartfelt appeals for your active participation to stop the slaughter by a speedy, decisive victory. We did not make propaganda in your country, and are proud in thinking that whatever success the cause of the Allies has gained has been due to its intrinsic value. Von Bethmann-Hollweg's charge that you defend international law one-sidedly against Germany is equal to an avowal that there is no law on their side.

Under such conditions we confidently and warmly greet your coming decision to espouse the common cause of humanity and thus to enforce peace not only after the war, but during the war, by adding your fresh effort to immense sacrifices borne by the Allied nations.

Petrograd, March 6

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED